

*The*  
**American Historical Review**

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN  
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

THE thirteenth annual meeting of the American Historical Association was held at Cleveland on December 28, 29 and 30, 1897. Once before the Association had met west of the Alleghanies, but it was at the Chicago exhibition of 1893 and the meeting was exceptional in character. If Cleveland is hardly to be called a western town, yet a truly western hospitality was manifested toward the Association and its congener, the American Economic Association, which by a happy arrangement held its meetings in the same city on the 29th, 30th and 31st. Professor Henry E. Bourne and the other members of the local committee of arrangements were unwearied and highly successful in their efforts to promote the comfort and pleasure of those who attended the meetings. Mr. and Mrs. J. H. Wade, Mr. and Mrs. H. A. Garfield, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Mather, on the successive days respectively, threw open their houses to the visitors, and President Thwing, of Western Reserve University, entertained them at luncheon within the walls of that institution. An especially agreeable social event was the common breakfast of the two associations, at noon of the 29th, by which a practice inaugurated at the New York meeting was pleasantly continued and assured of permanence; and, of course, that less formal sociability which to many constitutes the chief attraction of the meetings prevailed at the hotel which was chosen as headquarters and at all the various places—the hall of the Board of Education, the Church of the Unity, and the libraries of the University and of the Western Reserve Historical Society—in which the sessions were held.

The most striking general feature of the transactions was the prevalence of discussions of practical topics interesting to the profes-

sion, rather than of formal contributions to knowledge. Thus the first session, after the reading of a brief paper by Mr. George P. Winship, of Providence, on the sources of our knowledge of the history of John Cabot's discoveries, was devoted to a discussion of the question: To what extent may "Sources" profitably be used in the teaching of History below the Graduate School? The discussion was principally carried on by Professor A. B. Hart, of Harvard University, Professor J. A. Woodburn, of the University of Indiana, and Professor E. P. Cheyney, of the University of Pennsylvania. Professor Hart spoke chiefly of the technical aspects of the problem, as related to different classes of sources.

Professor Woodburn dwelt first on the great variations of the factors in the problem, the widely varying abundance of materials in the possession of different institutions, the wide differences among undergraduates in respect to culture and training. For the ordinary undergraduate he was strongly of the opinion that training in the use of sources should by no means be the chief aim in instruction. Such an undergraduate approaches his college courses in history without any adequate conception of the great historic movements of the world. He ought first to obtain a broad general notion of these movements. This is his evident primary need, and if he is to reach this end, in the time he ordinarily devotes to history, he cannot become an investigator. He has not the time, nor the opportunity, nor the aptitude, nor (most emphatically) the scholarship, to make the attempt profitable. Much as he may dislike to do it, or as we may dislike to have him do it, he must content himself with accepting the direction and findings of the best authorities who have gone before him. But while convinced that the use of the sources is not an important end of the undergraduate's work in history, the speaker gave it a prominent place among the means of reaching the end, the end being the acquisition of general historical culture. Such use has now been made more practicable than ever before, by the multiplication of excellent books of extracts. Fragmentary though they are, and therefore in some respects unsatisfactory, experience shows that students feel their value in making the events of history more real, in conveying impressions more forcibly and aiding in the retention of facts, in cultivating a taste for research and promoting the exercise of independent judgment. True pedagogical principles point in the same direction, urging that, instead of being furnished with outright solutions to all problems, the student be led, as far as is possible, to discover and produce for himself, with a mind not merely receptive, but active. The important question of proportion should receive an answer determined by the circumstances of each

particular case ; the undergraduate should be trained in the use of sources to as large an extent as the end in view—the end of liberal culture in historical knowledge—will permit.

Professor Cheyney's paper was devoted specifically to a discussion of the matter as a general theoretical question. With undergraduates, he thought, the sources should be used primarily for purposes of illustration ; not to furnish the main content of the student's course, nor to give him technical training in methods of investigation. He defended their use on two main grounds : first, the greater sense of reality which is obtained by their use ; secondly, the mental culture in the form of habits of moderation and fairness, and in the training in critical judgment, which follows upon even a comparatively slight familiarity with the actual sources of our knowledge. These claims were tested by several historical examples. An effort was made to show by these that the vagueness and unreality of historical impressions can be overcome by bringing the student into contact with the vivid real words and personality of contemporary writings. The effect on the general culture of the student lies rather in bringing him, through the study of actual instances, to look at things as they really are, without exaggeration and without partisan condemnation, and in training the capacity to judge of the worth or worthlessness of the books which are constantly forcing upon us their claims for consideration. The question under discussion should then be answered in some such way as follows : Within the limits of practicability the sources should be used wherever they will illustrate or supplement or give reality to the work, and wherever they will teach a lesson of historical judgment without at the same time destroying the unity and the continuity of the student's course.

Professor F. M. Fling, of the University of Nebraska, gave an interesting account of the use of sources (in English translation) in the secondary schools of that state, and advocated their being made the staple of historical instruction. But the general view seemed to be that their proper use was rather as a vivifying adjunct to text-books, lectures and the reading of authoritative historians.

The afternoon was assigned to a meeting of the Church History Section. The notion of such a special section was devised a year before, when the American Church History Society was absorbed into the American Historical Association ; and, though the sectional meeting thus inaugurated exhibited no such certain signs of great vitality as surely ought to attend a meeting in the interest of church history in America, yet the plan so far met with favor that another section, devoted to the study of legal history, was projected as an



accompaniment of subsequent meetings of the Association. Three papers were read before the section. The first was an essay on The Philosophical Disintegration of Islam, by Rev. H. W. Hulbert of Cleveland. After the first century of territorial expansion Islam at Damascus and Baghdad and Cordova came into contact with remnants of Greek philosophy and Christian heresy. The result was, east and west, a struggle to harmonize the Koranic faith with philosophy and, out of this, the rise of innumerable Mohammedan sects. Though the process would seem to be not without a parallel in Christian history, the purpose of the paper, in reviewing the speculative thinkers of Islam, was to exhibit its inability to keep its identity in the face of the philosophical attack, and its collapse as a theological system, until the Ottoman came in to maintain orthodoxy by the sword. The Rev. James I. Good of Reading, Pa., next read an account of the work of the Netherland churches in fostering the German Reformed churches in America, and of the steps by which the latter won their home rule. The Rev. Dr. S. M. Jackson of New York gave an account of a recent pilgrimage to the places associated with the life of Zwingli.

In the evening the Association listened to the inaugural address of its president, Dr. James Schouler of Boston. He began by remarking upon the large increase of the Association during the past year ; more than three hundred new names had been added, largely through the exertions of the Hon. Peter White of Marquette, so that the total membership is now 928. Reference was made to those members who had died during the past year, twelve in number, including Dr. Justin Winsor, formerly president of the Association, to whose memory a feeling tribute was paid, Gen. Francis A. Walker, and Hon. Horatio King. The main subject of the address was "Constitutional Amendments and a New Federal Convention." Referring to the Philadelphia Convention of 1787, Dr. Schouler adverted to the striking fact that that body, a novelty in its own day, had had no similar successor, numerous as had been the conventions which had made amendments or new constitutions for the individual states. In the states, where a century ago the representative legislatures were habitually exalted, the modern tendency is to raise the other departments to an equality, as all alike based fundamentally on popular sanction ; and the *referendum* gains constantly the upper hand. Urging the desirableness of a limited federal convention, which should consider and act upon specific proposals alone, Dr. Schouler discussed at length those amendments which seemed to him worthy of adoption. First, he advocated the choice of senators of the United States by the people of a state at large. In the



line of a manifest tendency to interpose greater barriers to Congressional legislation, on some topics at least, than are imposed by the present Constitution, he thought it might be well to insist upon a two-thirds vote in each branch for changing the currency, declaring war, or borrowing or appropriating beyond certain limits ; and that more than a bare majority of a quorum ought certainly to be required for such momentous legislation, disturbing the national equilibrium, as the admission of new states into the Union, or as that which sanctions the acquisition of alien territory with an alien population. Dr. Schouler further expressed the wish to see literally extended to the Union that prohibition on the states which expressly forbids them to emit bills of credit, to make anything but gold and silver coin a legal tender in payment of debts, or to pass any law impairing the obligation of a contract. He also advocated the election of the President and the Vice-President by popular vote, and by a plurality in case there were no majority. It might likewise be desirable to enlarge the President's veto power, so that he might at discretion veto individual items of an appropriation bill while approving the rest, or so as to leave him thirty days after the close of each session of Congress in which to decide whether to approve or to disapprove of its final measures.

After the conclusion of the president's address, Professor F. M. Fling read a paper entitled "Mirabeau and Calonne in 1785." The paper dealt with the history of the book on the Bank of St. Charles, written by Mirabeau in 1785 at the request of Calonne. The subject has already been well treated by Stern and Loménie. The reason for re-examining it was the discovery by Professor Fling of an unpublished manuscript, unknown to previous biographers, and containing an account of a conversation that took place between Mirabeau and Calonne on the day on which the book was published. This conversation was recorded by Mirabeau in the form of a dialogue, shortly after it took place, and evidently with a view to publication. From this document it becomes clear that Calonne consulted with Mirabeau before the decree of council was issued condemning the bank. Mirabeau realized that Calonne was unable to prevent the council from taking action, and that he might be exiled or sent to the Bastille. He placed himself completely in Calonne's hands, and as he personally was not molested he had little to complain of.

The last paper of this day was one by Professor J. M. Vincent of Johns Hopkins University, on "European Blue Laws." He showed that strict laws for the conduct of the private citizen were not a monopoly or invention of the Puritans. Regulations as to clothing, eating, drinking and the observance of Sunday were found

all over Europe during the same period in both Catholic and Protestant countries. In fact, sumptuary laws were common during the Middle Ages, and the Reformers merely continued the old methods of dealing with the problems of society. It was a general political maxim that the authorities should regulate even the small particulars of life and manners. Examples of the medieval regulation of clothing were given from France and Switzerland. Though the Reformation introduced greater sobriety of manners, yet legal regulation continued. Zürich and Bern, it was shown, were nearly as strict as Geneva. The laws of the former two towns with regard to church-going, taverns and drinking, personal adornments and social entertainments, were exhibited in some detail, as were also the sumptuary laws of Louis XIV. The significant generalization was that inquisitorial laws continued to be enacted on the Continent for nearly three centuries after the Reformation, and were found in operation as late as, or later than, the Blue Laws of the American colonies.

The proceedings of the second day were altogether pedagogical in their interest. At the New York meeting a committee of seven had been constituted, at the request of the National Educational Association, to investigate the condition of historical teaching in the secondary schools throughout the United States, in order, if possible, to recommend some scheme or schemes for its improvement. The committee consisted of Professor A. C. McLaughlin of the University of Michigan, its chairman, Professor H. B. Adams of the Johns Hopkins University, Professor H. Morse Stephens of Cornell University, Professor A. B. Hart of Harvard, Miss Lucy M. Salmon, professor at Vassar College, Professor C. H. Haskins of the University of Wisconsin, and Mr. George L. Fox, headmaster of the Hopkins Grammar School at New Haven. The committee had pursued its task with energy and devotion during the year, and had held consultations which culminated in a series of meetings at Cleveland.

In presenting the committee's report the chairman, Professor McLaughlin, called the attention of the Association to the purpose for which the committee had been created, to recommend to a committee of the National Educational Association a course of study in history which might be taken as the basis for a portion of a scheme of uniform requirements for entrance to college. Before the committee could make such a report, however, many things had to be done. Information had to be gathered concerning the present condition of historical study in the schools, and then a course had to be worked out which was suited to the needs of the college and not beyond the ability of the schools.

Moreover, the committee felt that it was highly desirable to make an examination of the whole field and prepare a report that would be helpful, stimulating and suggestive to the secondary teachers of the country. To ascertain present conditions, circulars were sent to nearly five hundred schools; something over two hundred answers were received, and the answers had been cast into tabulated form. For the purpose of getting suggestions as to courses of study and methods of teaching, three members of the committee visited European schools during the summer of 1897, and after a careful examination prepared reports upon the condition of historical study in the secondary schools of Germany, France and England. Miss Salmon had made an exceedingly thorough investigation into the teaching of history in German gymnasia, Mr. Haskins had examined into the teaching in the secondary institutions of France, Mr. Fox into those of England. Miss Salmon, as the result of her exhaustive study of German programmes and methods, read to the Association this same morning a highly interesting paper on The Teaching of History in German Gymnasia, which has since been printed in the *Educational Review* for February. We may therefore refer our readers to the pages of that journal for the full text of that instructive communication. It must suffice here to present a brief summary. History, in connection with geography and in due correlation to other studies, is taught throughout the nine years of the gymnasial course, which begins when the boy is nine years old. The average amount of time devoted to its teaching is three hours per week. During the first two years the boy is taught legends from classical and German mythology and the biographies of great men. No attempt is made to give formal instruction in chronological order; the method is story-telling, pure and simple. Systematic historical instruction begins with the third year in the gymnasium. During the remainder of the course the work in history and geography forms two regular concentric circles, the first occupying four years, the second three. The object of the first circuit is to give a connected account of the great events of the world's history, ancient, medieval and modern, and especially of the relation of Germany to these events; the method is that of pure narration. During the last three years the pupil traverses the general field of history again, but with the object of laying the foundations deeper, of gaining a broader outlook, of understanding present conditions through their development in the past, of building upon the love of fatherland that has been so sedulously cultivated in the earlier part of the course a sense of personal responsibility to it, of inspiring high ideals and creating ethical standards. The method



of treatment is adapted to this final aim and to the boy's maturer state of mind. It becomes more formal, and somewhat resembles that of a college lecture. Miss Salmon pointed out the natural differences of aim between German and American historical instruction, and praised with warmth the competence and mental equipment of the teachers of history in German schools.

The committee found that, in spite of many meetings and discussions, it was ready as yet to make only a provisional report and asked for the privilege of continuing its labors. It was ready to report with some definiteness an ideal course covering four years, with five recitations a week ; but the more difficult problem of preparing practical recommendations for a schedule of entrance requirements was still to be solved. In the ideal course the committee recommended four sections or blocks of history, each to occupy a year : (1) Ancient history, including a very general introductory study of the more ancient nations, and the history of Greece and Rome to the downfall of the Empire, the histories of the two nations to be studied, as far as practicable, as related subjects ; (2) The history of Continental Europe, beginning with the fall of Rome and ending in the nineteenth century ; (3) English history, to be studied in its broader aspects and to include somewhat extensive references to Continental relations and imperial development ; (4) American history, with special reference to the Federal period, and with the collateral study of civil government.

On the subject of method the committee recommended that a text-book in chief be used, and expressed the conviction that written exercises, the preparation of topics in written or oral form, the constant use and occasional making of maps, were desirable additions to the text-book work ; that collateral reading in secondary material should be a part of every course, and that when practicable the sources should be used ; that sources were principally useful in giving reality and concreteness to the facts of history, and could be used by the teacher for the purpose of illustration, and often by the pupil himself for the same purpose.

As for the teaching of history in grades below that of the high school, the committee did not feel warranted yet in making definite recommendations, desiring to make further examination into the present status of the matter ; but they agreed that it was desirable to teach, in elementary ways, the history and government of our own country, with some preliminary or collateral study of European history. The committee's whole report was approved by the Association, and the committee was continued. It is understood that, after more preliminary work by individual members, it will meet this spring in Ann Arbor.

Mr. A. F. Nightingale, superintendent of schools in Chicago and chairman of one of the departments of the National Educational Association, read a short paper, the conclusions of which were in striking accord with those of the committee of seven. He advised that the fields of history be taken up in chronological order, and that general history, as it is now studied and taught, be abandoned. In the discussion which followed these papers, Professor Fling expressed his regret that the committee's recommendations on the use of sources were not more decided and more radical. He contended that if the pupils were not brought into immediate contact with the sources such material would never be used at all, even for purposes of illustration. He declared that all the tendencies in historical teaching in America and Europe were in the direction of the "source method." Professor Hart, replying to Professor Fling, said that he did not believe that pupils in the secondary schools could as a rule make use of the sources as the primary means of gaining knowledge, but that original material vitalized the dry facts of history and gave them new force and meaning. Professor Haskins and Miss Salmon did not think, after having made some study of the matter, that there was any tendency in Europe in the direction of the increased use of the sources by pupils. Miss Salmon said that she had made special inquiries regarding this subject in all of the German gymnasia which she had visited, and that she had not found the source-books used anywhere by the pupils.

The evening session of this day, a session held jointly with the American Economic Association, but mostly occupied with history, was devoted to a discussion of the opportunities for American students of history and economics in Europe. Professor C. H. Haskins of the University of Wisconsin read a paper on the Opportunities for American Students of History at Paris, which is printed in the present issue of this REVIEW. Professor O. J. Thatcher of the University of Chicago, who was to have read a paper on Opportunities for American Students of History in Germany, was unfortunately prevented from attending, nor was his paper presented. Professor H. Morse Stephens of Cornell University discoursed informally upon the opportunities for the Study of History at Oxford and Cambridge, but shortly gave way to Mr. Wilbur C. Abbott, now of the University of Michigan, who recently pursued the newly-instituted course for the "research degree" at Oxford. Both were of one mind, that Oxford in some respects presented admirable advantages to the mature student, but was no place for the tyro, who would find little machinery in existence intended for his benefit and guidance. Indeed, it was the general opinion of these speakers, and of Professor C. H. Hull of Cornell University, who

spoke briefly and informally on the study of political economy and political science in Germany, that the appropriate time for European studies on the part of American students was not immediately after their taking the first degree, but later, the American universities having now developed their graduate instruction so fully as to make it better for the student to pursue his work in America during the first years after baccalaureate graduation.

The morning of the third day was also spent in joint session with the economists, and was devoted to a discussion, chiefly by members of that profession, of the Relation of the Teaching of Economic History to the Teaching of Political Economy. The discussion was led by Professor Henry B. Gardner of Brown University, Professor Henry R. Seager of the University of Pennsylvania, and Professor George W. Knight of the Ohio State University. The necessity of carrying the study of economic history into the most advanced stages of instruction in economics being generally conceded, the purpose of Professor Gardner's paper was to urge the importance of including systematic instruction in economic history in the general introductory course in political economy usually given in our colleges. The purpose of such courses is, for most students, to develop the capacity to form intelligent and liberal judgments on present economic questions. With this end in view, the information given should include: (1) a description of the most essential features of the structure and working of the economic organization; (2) a statement of the main principles or laws revealed by an analysis of its fundamental forces; (3) a critical estimate of the system and of the more important plans for modifying it. Now instruction has generally been concentrated on economic analysis and its results, the other parts being treated not systematically, but incidentally, to illustrate the analysis. Under such training the student will not be able to estimate correctly the real scope and significance of economic theory, not seeing clearly its relations to economic life as a whole nor perceiving its limitations. He will be tempted either to reject it as merely theoretical, or on the other hand to ignore its divergences from the facts of actual life. In respect to practical problems he will not know how to distinguish what is essential and rigid in the existing system from what is non-essential and flexible. Hence the speaker concluded that a description of the structure and working of the economic organism is essential even in an introductory course in economics, and that this description should be systematic and comprehensive. But in order to understand what is characteristic in the existing organization, to estimate justly the relative importance and permanence of its various elements, and to distinguish its controlling tendencies, it is, if not



absolutely necessary, at least extremely helpful to understand its historical origin and to compare it with earlier and simpler systems. This could best be done by a comprehensive view of economic history, which could show the movements and interrelations of economic life as a whole, and which should precede the description of the existing system, acquainting the student first with the simpler forms of organization and enabling him to trace the actual course of economic development.

Professor Seager held that introductory courses in economic history existed mainly because of the defects of historical teaching, and would become unnecessary whenever courses in general history were so recast as to assign due prominence to economic forces. Agreeing that a course in descriptive economics should precede the theoretical course, he did not think that a course in economic history should do so. Its proper place was after the theoretical course, and its aim, to remove or make impossible the notion that the economic institutions of to-day and their mutual relations are permanent and inevitable. This could best be done, not by a course which presented a continuous outline of economic history, but by intensive study of some one period, especially a period differing as widely as possible from the present in its economic organization. Economic history should be studied also in connection with the history of economic theory and with the study of practical economic problems. The former study is valuable only when the attempt is made to interpret the economic theories accepted in each period in the light of the industrial conditions to which they owe their origin. As regards the latter, no practical problem can be treated adequately except with reference to the historical conditions out of which it has arisen.

Professor Knight was of opinion that the teaching of economic history should precede the teaching of political economy. He pointed out that the study of political institutions and of theories of the state everywhere follows upon, never precedes, the study of the political history of the state. Since at present the teacher of history is not covering this portion of the historical field, it must, as yet, be treated as a distinct thing, and probably by the economist rather than by the historian. The increase of such teaching in colleges and universities was noted. Later should come the history of economic theory in connection with the intensive study of economic history in detail and by periods and institutions.

The concluding session of the Association was devoted to a discussion of the functions of local historical societies. Two papers were read: one by Mr. R. G. Thwaites, corresponding secretary of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, on State-supported Histor-

ical Societies and their Functions, the other by Professor J. F. Jameson of Brown University, on The Functions of State and Local Historical Societies with respect to Research and Publication. But to this general subject the REVIEW may not improbably recur on a later occasion. This session was held in the beautiful new building of the Western Reserve Historical Society, and was the first meeting ever held therein. A considerable number of papers, read only by title, were submitted for publication in the annual volume of the Association.

A report on behalf of the Historical Manuscripts Commission was submitted by its chairman, Professor Jameson. An interesting plan proposed by Miss Salmon, professor in Vassar College, was encouraged and referred to the secretary and Miss Salmon. It contemplated the affiliation of local historical societies with the American Historical Association, by payment of annual dues or the fees for life-membership, and with mutual duties of communication and report. Proposals were brought forward, in view of the approaching expiration (in July) of the guarantee fund of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, for its adoption by the Association. Definite action upon this matter was deferred until the next annual meeting. In the meantime, a grant was made to the REVIEW from the treasury of the Association, in consideration of which each member of the latter is to receive a copy of the issues of the REVIEW for next October and January, that all may be prepared to vote intelligently upon proposals for union next December.

The officers of the Association elected for the ensuing year are : President, Professor George P. Fisher of Yale University ; first vice-president, Mr. James Ford Rhodes of Boston ; second vice-president, Dr. Edward Eggleston ; secretary and treasurer, as heretofore, Professor Herbert B. Adams and Dr. Clarence W. Bowen, respectively. Dr. Schouler became *ex officio* a member of the executive council ; President E. M. Gallaudet and Professor George B. Adams retired from that body, and their places were filled by the election of Chief-Justice M. W. Fuller and Professor A. B. Hart. The next meeting is to occur at New Haven on December 27, 28 and 29, 1898. The committee on the programme consists of Professor E. G. Bourne of Yale, Professors Hart of Harvard, Judson of Chicago, Turner of Wisconsin, and the secretary.

The *Annual Report* of the Association for 1896, a volume of 1107 pages, has not reached the office of the REVIEW at the time of going to press, but the receipt of several "separates" from it gives promise of its speedy appearance. The largest of these separate issues is the Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, comprising 641 pages (pp. 467-1107) of the volume. The Report consists of a re-

port in the more special sense, setting forth the aims of the Commission and the steps it has hitherto taken toward the realization of those aims, a careful bibliography of American archives, or, more explicitly, a List of Printed Guides to and Descriptions of Archives and other Repositories of Historical Manuscript, prepared by Dr. E. C. Burnett and the chairman, and five series of historical documents, printed as specimens of the mode in which the Commission proposes to deal with the most important of those manuscripts to which it may be led by the systematic inquiries it is pursuing. The first of these is a series of the letters of Phineas Bond, consul at Philadelphia, to the British Foreign Office in 1787, 1788 and 1789, letters interesting for the light they throw on the economic, and in a less degree the political, history of the United States during that transitional period. Next comes a body of correspondence relating to an attempted intrigue with the French government, carried on from Philadelphia in 1756, and disclosed through the intercepting, by the British officials in England and Ireland, of letters addressed to the Duke de Mirepoix. Next is printed a collection, derived from various sources, of the letters of Stephen Higginson, a Boston merchant, highly influential in politics and conspicuous among the high Federalists. The letters extend over an interesting period (1783-1804) and cast light on many important transactions. The political history of South Carolina, 1805-1808, is illustrated by the publication of a series of extracts from the diary of Edward Hooker, who lived at Columbia during those years. Finally, the long-continued and widely ramifying intrigues of France for the possession of the Mississippi Valley, and especially the intrigues of Citizen Genet with George Rogers Clark and the projected expedition of the latter against the Spaniards in New Orleans, are illuminated by a highly important and varied collection of documents edited by Professor Turner. The commission actively continues its pursuit of manuscripts. Its second report will present some of the results of the pursuit, together with the second instalment of the Phineas Bond letters and the correspondence of Genet with Mangourit, French consul at Charleston. With the aid of these two series of Genet documents and those printed in the present number of the REVIEW, Professor Turner prepares for our next number a new account of Genet's relations with the West. For its third report the Commission expects to present a first instalment of the correspondence of John C. Calhoun. The trustees of Clemson Agricultural College, which possesses the chief mass of his papers, has agreed to entrust them to the Commission for publication. The Commission, earnestly desirous to do this important piece of work thoroughly, hope that those who know of other Calhoun letters will inform the chairman.



## OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICAN STUDENTS OF HISTORY AT PARIS<sup>1</sup>

THE topic assigned me this evening is not entirely a new one. Two former presidents of this association have had occasion to discuss briefly the progress of historical studies in France,<sup>2</sup> and, thanks to our secretary, Americans have long been familiar with the excellent report upon historical work at Paris prepared by Professor Fredericq of the University of Ghent and translated in the *Johns Hopkins University Studies*.<sup>3</sup> Quite recently, too, the newspapers have had something to say concerning the educational opportunities of the French capital, and there are at least three committees—a *Comité Franco-Américain*, a Paris-American University Committee, and an American Advisory Committee—charged with disseminating information and strengthening academic relations between France and America. My excuse for venturing into the field is that important changes have taken place in the fifteen years since Fredericq's account appeared, and that, in spite of newspapers and committees, there is not accessible, so far as I know, a statement of what is actually done in France in the various lines of work to which the attention of American students is being directed. In attempting to show what Paris offers and what it does not offer in the department of history I shall try to be as succinct and definite as possible; it will, I trust, be evident that I hold no brief for French schools and make no plea for Paris as the unique goal of the historical student.

In limiting the subject to Paris I am well aware that Paris is not France and that instruction in history is not confined to the metropolis. Much has been done of late to improve the condition of the provincial universities, so that Professor Bréal, an active leader in the movement to increase the attendance of students from this side

<sup>1</sup> Read before the American Historical Association at its meeting at Cleveland, December 29, 1897.

<sup>2</sup> Andrew D. White, *European Schools of History and Politics*, in the *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, December, 1887. Charles Kendall Adams, *Recent Historical Work in the Colleges and Universities of Europe and America*, *Papers of the American Historical Association*, IV. 39-65.

<sup>3</sup> *The Study of History in Germany and France*, *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, May-June, 1890. Work in history at Paris is also described, largely on the basis of his own observations in 1890, by Altamira in the second edition of his *Enseñanza de la Historia*, 35-90. The recent impressions of a Belgian student, E. Lameere, will be found in the *Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles* for 1896, Nos. 7-10.

of the Atlantic, has expressed the hope that many Americans might be drawn to them by the desire "to know French life intimately and in its purity," to revel in the rare climate of Bordeaux or Montpellier, or to enjoy the beauties of Grenoble "within sight of the Alps, beside the swift waters of the Isère."<sup>1</sup> Now Grenoble is a delightful place in summer, as I can testify, and the winter climate of Paris may easily be surpassed in the south, but these things of themselves are not sufficient to attract the serious student. The provincial universities suffer from the evils common to the whole educational system of France, plus the depressing influence of excessive centralization, and they have none of the advantages of special schools, great libraries, etc., which are found at the capital. There are excellent men in many of the provincial faculties, but it can safely be said that for the present, at least, the American who goes to France to study will turn his steps toward Paris.

The organization of higher instruction in France is in sharp contrast with our ordinary conceptions of the character of the French people. Instead of being simple and logical, higher education is complicated and unsystematic; instead of having been radically made over from time to time, it has evolved slowly, with large deference to conservative prejudice and vested interests. As a result, the system has grown by additions rather than by alterations, by the creation of new agencies rather than by the modification and enlargement of old ones, so that each successive period in the history of modern France has left one or more representatives in the congeries of existing institutions of learning. Thus the Collège de France is a survival of the old régime, the École Polytechnique is the creation of the Convention, the Faculties were organized by Napoleon, the École des Chartes was established under the Restoration, the École des Hautes Etudes owes its origin to the Second Empire.

If any one thing has been characteristic of French education amid all the vicissitudes of the past hundred years, it is the system of special schools, designed to prepare men for a single definite career, rather than the university with its varied opportunities and broad ideas of culture and research. Adopted by the Convention to meet the pressing needs created by the suppression of the old universities, the system of special schools was permanently established by the First Empire. Afterward, as new needs appeared, new schools were created, while at the same time the old schools sought to enlarge their facilities in the direction of general studies

<sup>1</sup> *Journal des Débats*, June 7, 1895, as quoted in the pamphlet issued in that year under the title *The Comité Franco-Américain of Paris*.

and thus become miniature universities. The professors of the faculties of letters and science, the only bodies not strictly professional in character, had no regular duties of instruction and spent their time in examining candidates for certain degrees and in delivering lectures before a miscellaneous audience who came for an hour's pleasant entertainment or perhaps to keep warm and read the newspapers. The Collège de France was in exactly the same position except that its professors held no examinations. The whole system wasted resources by the duplication of buildings, appliances, and teachers inevitable under a régime of isolated professional schools; overburdened faculties and students with an artificial system of examinations; encouraged superficiality and rhetorical display among the professors; and deprived students both of a thorough scientific training and of contact with practical affairs.<sup>1</sup>

The movement for the reform of higher education began toward the close of the Second Empire, largely through the influence of men who had studied in Germany and had been impressed with the superior advantages of their neighbors beyond the Rhine, and it was powerfully furthered by the events of 1870 and 1871. Changes have come slowly among a people which finds it easier to plan large reforms than to execute small ones, and the system is still in process of transformation, but in certain directions great advances have been made. The special schools have not been suppressed, but they no longer monopolize the field. The faculties of letters and science are now teaching and investigating as well as lecturing bodies, and have added to their previous duties the work of preparing teachers, once exclusively performed by the *Ecole Normale*. The expenditures for higher education have greatly increased, and the various groups of faculties have taken the name and caught something of the spirit of universities. Some improvement has been made in the programmes of examinations, while by the establishment of the *École des Hautes Études* opportunity has been given for thorough training in investigation in all the principal branches of knowledge.

The progress accomplished in France within a generation is nowhere more apparent than in the subject of history. Thirty years ago the opportunities for historical instruction at Paris were limited to the displays of oratory at the Sorbonne and Collège de France, the closed courses of the *École Normale*—as yet untouched by the hand of Fustel de Coulanges—and the special training of the *Ecole des Chartes*, of which more will be said later. To-day, apart

<sup>1</sup> Condensed from the excellent article of Langlois on *The Question of Universities in France*, in the *Political Science Quarterly*, September, 1894.



from the École Normale, which is not open to the public, and certain courses at the Law School and Collège de France which lie rather in the field of economics and political science than in that of history proper, the student of history may avail himself, not only of the École des Chartes and of the enlarged and invigorated Faculty of Letters, but of the new École des Hautes Études and École Libre des Sciences Politiques—all with the exception of the École Libre open without charge<sup>1</sup> to foreigners as well as natives and to women as well as men. In these four institutions alone there are this year, leaving out of account the related work in language and archaeology, twenty-eight different professors of history, offering fifty-five distinct courses—a number of instructors and courses equal to those of Berlin and Leipzig combined. In all this variety there is very little duplication of work, in spite of the independence of each school. Indeed, as has recently been remarked, the Faculty of Letters, the École des Hautes Études, and the École des Chartes, all now installed in the new buildings of the Sorbonne, are but the distinct departments of the historical faculty of an ideal University of Paris, vaster even than the university actually authorized by the recent law.<sup>2</sup> Let us see what each of these institutions has to offer.

The Faculty of Letters of the University of Paris is in theory an institution for the encouragement and diffusion of higher culture, a centre of research and training in historical and philological investigation, and a normal school for the preparation of teachers for *lycées* and colleges.<sup>3</sup> In actual practice its energies are chiefly absorbed in the task of preparing candidates for the examinations leading to the *licence* and *agrégation*, and by far the greater number of its students are working for these degrees. Two sorts of courses are offered: the public lecture, open to everybody as of old but primarily addressed to students, who form a constantly growing element in the audience; and the closed course (*cours fermé, conférence*), to which only matriculates are admitted. The nature of the closed courses depends largely upon the tastes of the instructor. Sometimes they consist of a series of set lectures on a topic previously announced, sometimes they are transformed into seminars for the detailed study of an author or an epoch; but more commonly they take the form of explanations of the authors and texts which are found on the examination programmes of the year, or of practical exercises in teaching conducted by the pupils in turn under the criticism of the instructor and the rest of the class.

<sup>1</sup> The Faculty of Letters demands certain inconsiderable fees from candidates for degrees.

<sup>2</sup> Langlois and Seignobos, *Introduction aux Études Historiques*, 306.

<sup>3</sup> *Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement*, November 15, 1897, p. 417.

VOL. III.—28

Of the forty-eight professors and instructors who announce courses in the Faculty of Letters this year,<sup>1</sup> eleven devote themselves entirely to historical subjects. Ancient history is represented by Bouché-Leclercq, the well-known writer upon Roman religion and institutions, Guiraud, the talented pupil and biographer of Fustel de Coulanges, and Grébaut, who confines his attention to Oriental history. The chair of medieval history is held by Luchaire, the distinguished master of the Capetian epoch. For the modern period there are four professors: Lavissee, the director of the department of history and geography, who lectures on the age of Louis XIV. and conducts a series of admirable exercises for future teachers, Aulard, who occupies the chair of the history of the French Revolution established by the city of Paris, Zeller, and Rambaud, at present Minister of Public Instruction and replaced at the Sorbonne by Denis of the University of Bordeaux. The list also includes Seignobos, who considers questions of historical method and their application to secondary instruction, Langlois, who lectures on bibliography and palaeography and conducts a seminary for research in the Middle Ages, and Lemonnier, who treats of the history of art in its relations to the history of civilization. The student's choice will naturally be governed by his tastes and opportunities, but whatever his special interests, he should at least endeavor to profit by the varied and accurate information and rigorous scientific methods of Langlois, the originality and suggestiveness of Seignobos, and the brilliant lectures of Lavissee, unsurpassed models in their combination of matter and form.

Of the degrees conferred by the Faculty of Letters, two only, the doctorate in letters and the diploma in history and geography, are of interest to the foreign student. The French doctorate is a distinctive institution, the peculiarities of which are not generally understood abroad, where from the similarity of name it is usually supposed to represent the equivalent of the German and American doctorates, from which it differs in several important respects. In order to become a candidate for the doctorate in France it is necessary, not only to possess the degree of bachelor, which corresponds roughly to the certificate of graduation from a German gymnasium; one must also be *licencié* in letters, that is, one must have spent on the average at least two years in further study at a university and passed examinations in Greek, Latin, French and certain elective

<sup>1</sup> The various courses given at Paris each year are enumerated in the *Livret de l'Étudiant de Paris*, a small pamphlet issued in November under the auspices of the University Council. Unfortunately it has not yet become the practice to make announcements much in advance of the time of opening in November, but there is not much change from year to year in the work offered. According to a recent announcement in the *Nation* M. Henry Bréal, 70 Rue d'Assas, will be glad to give information to intending students.

subjects. Once *licencié*, the candidate has no further requirements of time or residence to fulfil for the doctorate, nor are there any examinations beyond the public defence of the thesis, an ordeal of at least four hours and by no means so simple an affair as the Prussian *Disputation*. Everything centres in the theses, which are two in number, one in Latin, corresponding in length and general character to the ordinary German dissertation, the other in French, averaging from three hundred to six hundred pages in length and dealing in a thorough and comprehensive manner with an important subject. In theory a student may present himself at once upon receiving the *licence*, in practice, owing to the nature of the thesis, several years intervene, so that many Frenchmen are well along in the thirties before they become doctors. From one point of view, the French doctorate is less exacting than the German or our own, since there are no requirements of subordinate subjects and tests of the candidate's general knowledge of the field in which he presents himself, these matters being presumably covered by the *licence* and the training necessary to produce a satisfactory thesis; but on the other hand, the standard of the thesis is in France much higher. It is not an *Erstlingsarbeit*, not simply a proof of ability to carry on investigation, but a solid and mature production, designed as an original contribution to knowledge worthy, if possible, of the praise summed up in the reviewer's term *définitif*. To see that there is no comparison between the French and the German dissertations, one has only to examine a number of the history theses in French—those in Latin are well understood to stand on a different footing—such as the recent works of Petit-Dutaillis on Louis VIII. and of Funck-Brentano on Philip the Fair and Flanders. The earlier American theses preserved the German idea, but there are some recent indications of a trend in the French direction; certainly volumes like Coffin's *Quebec Act*, Hazen's *American Opinion of the French Revolution*, and several of the *Columbia Studies* and *Harvard Monographs*, are not of the traditional type.

Until the present year the French doctorate was practically closed to foreigners, since the government steadfastly refused to accept equivalents for the *licence*, which does not correspond exactly to any degree elsewhere, and no student ready to carry on advanced work cared to devote his time to preparing for the rhetorical compositions necessary for this degree. Recently, as a result of the praiseworthy efforts to remove obstacles which repelled foreign students, without impairing the value of the doctorate for French citizens, the newly constituted universities have been empowered to create and confer degrees which shall attest the scientific attainments of the recipients

but cannot carry with them any of the legal privileges of existing degrees. In the exercise of its new authority the Faculty of Letters of Paris voted in January, 1897, to establish the *doctorate de l'Université de Paris*, open to native and foreign students. The new doctorate demands of the French candidate the *licence* and of foreigners a certificate of previous training satisfactory to the Faculty; the period of study must extend over at least four semesters, two of which may be spent at another university; and the final tests consist of a thesis and examinations in two subjects.<sup>1</sup>

The *diplôme d'études supérieures* is an innovation of the year 1894 which is at present limited to the subjects of history and geography. Preparation for this degree involves the presentation and public discussion of a thesis—the more meritorious of these are hereafter to be published by the Faculty,—the treatment of an historical and a geographical problem assigned in advance of the examination, the critical commentary of a text, and examinations in geography or one of the sciences auxiliary to history. This diploma is a stage in the *agrégation d'histoire et de géographie*, the competitive examination for professorships of history and geography in the *lycées*, but it may also be sought independently by any one, without restriction of age, race, or academic degree. The thesis is supposed to show the candidate's power of investigation in much the same way as the German dissertation, and it is the hope of those interested in the new diploma that it will represent about the same degree of attainment as the German doctorate.<sup>2</sup> Whether this will prove true depends entirely upon those who have the conferring of the degrees in their hands, particularly since a sufficient preliminary training, guaranteed in the case of candidates for the *agrégation* by the necessity of having first received the *licence*, is not secured by any formal requirement in the case of other applicants. Should a high standard be maintained, the *diplôme d'études supérieures* will certainly prove attractive to foreign students, not because it is easier to obtain than the doctorate, but because it corresponds more nearly to the needs of the student at this stage in his development.

The École Pratique des Hautes Études is the child of Victor Duruy. Finding it impossible to bring the Faculties to accept his ideas of university reform, Duruy determined to found a new

<sup>1</sup> See the report of the committee of the Faculty in the *Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement*, March 15, 1897; and compare the report of Lavisé to the Conseil Supérieur de l'Instruction Publique in the same journal, October 15, 1897.

<sup>2</sup> See the opening addresses of Lavisé and Langlois in the *Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement*, November 15, 1895, and November 15, 1897. There is an interesting set of reports on the *diplôme d'études supérieures* in the various universities in the same journal for September 15, 1897.



school, whose prime object should be to teach its pupils how to study and investigate for themselves, and whose influence, he hoped, would in time destroy the old system of education. As established in 1868, the *École Pratique* consisted of four sections (now five), one of which comprised history and philology. The work of the school is open to all, "without condition of age, degree or nationality," who are willing to take active part in its exercises and can satisfy the instructor of their ability to do so. Beyond this there are no restrictions on the number and choice of courses and no fixed term of study. Those who have been in attendance three years and present a satisfactory thesis receive a diploma. Until it entered its quarters in the new Sorbonne last fall, the section of history and philology had its home in the upper rooms of the old university library, where the students were placed in the midst of the books and enjoyed opportunities of freer intercourse with their professors than is usual in France, so that some have questioned whether the spirit of the school will not lose something by abandoning its outgrown library garrets.

From the very beginning of the *École Pratique* the most active spirit in the development of its historical department has been Gabriel Monod, the accomplished editor of the *Revue Historique* and at present director of the section of history and philology. Associated with him are six well-known scholars: Thévenin, Roy, Giry, Longnon, Bémont and Reuss. Each instructor gives two courses, which are of an advanced and special character and are generally conducted on a plan similar to that of the German seminary. The subjects vary somewhat from year to year but within relatively narrow limits. Recently Monod has concentrated the attention of his students on the Carolingian period, with special reference to its legislative monuments, while Thévenin considers subjects of early Germanic law. Giry's conferences, admirable examples of historical method, are confined to the history of the ninth and tenth centuries, one exercise being at present devoted to the critical study of an annalist and the other to studies on the diplomatic sources of the period with reference to his forthcoming edition of the charters of the later Carolingians. Bémont treats by preference topics in the medieval history of England, a field in which he is an acknowledged master; frequently he gives one hour to lectures on the sources of English history and the other to the detailed study of some special topic. Longnon's work lies in the field of French historical geography, which he has made so peculiarly his own; Roy deals with the history of the later Middle Ages; Reuss has recently been added to the corps of teachers in order to give instruction in the history of modern Europe<sup>1</sup>. Stu-

dents of history may also attend with profit some of the related courses in the history of religions, which now form the fifth section of the school.

The École des Chartes, first established in 1821, is a special school for the training of archivists and librarians for the public service. The number of regular pupils admitted each year is limited to twenty, selected by competitive examination from candidates who have taken the bachelor's degree and have not passed the age of twenty-five; but the exercises of the school are freely open to the public, and there is always a good attendance of hearers at certain courses. The programme of studies covers three years and includes palaeography, diplomatics, archaeology, Romance philology, the history of French law and institutions, the sources of French history, bibliography and the organization of libraries and archives. Besides passing the regular examinations in these subjects, candidates for the diploma of *archiviste paléographe* are required to prepare a thesis based upon prolonged research and involving the use of manuscript materials. The conclusions to which the investigation has led are presented in printed form, and the whole thesis subjected to rigorous public examination by a committee of professors. Although the work of the school embraces the whole period down to 1789, particular emphasis is laid on the Middle Ages. The courses are not designed to give a systematic survey of the field of history or to study special periods in detail; the aim is rather to afford a comprehensive and thorough training in the subjects auxiliary to history, with special reference to the needs of future custodians of historical materials. In many respects unique, the work of the school has been of great importance in the development of sound historical scholarship in France, and it is held in high regard in other parts of Europe, where its example has been followed in the creation of institutions like the Scuola di Paleografia at Florence and the Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung at Vienna and in the recent movement for the establishment of a similar school in England.

From the nature of its work the École des Chartes appeals to but a limited constituency, but no serious student of French history or of the Middle Ages in general can afford to neglect it, particularly since the recent removal from the ill-lighted and inconvenient quarters at the Archives Nationales to the new building adjoining the Sorbonne has made it easily accessible to all. The much loved Gautier is gone, and with him the famous potpourri of palaeography

<sup>1</sup> The section publishes a series of monographs, the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études*, and an *Annuaire*, containing, besides the general regulations, reports on the work of the previous year and announcements of current courses.

and medieval lore which he served with such good humor, but one may still learn to read old manuscripts from his successor, E. Berger, while masters like Giry, Paul Meyer, A. Molinier and de Lasteyrie challenge comparison with the best in Europe.<sup>1</sup>

The École Libre des Sciences Politiques is a private institution, occupying quarters in the Rue St. Guillaume, about fifteen minutes' walk from the Sorbonne. It was established in 1871 primarily for the purpose of fitting young men for the civil service, and while it also gives opportunity for a good general training in political science, its organization and character are determined by the examinations of the various government departments for which it prepares. The plan of study covers two years and is divided into four sections: administration, economics and finance, diplomacy, and history and public law. The courses are of two types, the set lecture and the informal conference, which is usually devoted to the consideration of topics parallel to those treated in the lectures; the students also meet for reviews under quiz-masters, and the more advanced in each department are formed into groups for the purposes of investigation. As no previous knowledge of economics or political science is required for admission, the courses are of an elementary and descriptive character. History does not occupy a large place in the programme, the only historical matters treated being the constitutional development of France and certain other countries in the nineteenth century, the diplomatic history of Europe since the Treaty of Utrecht, and recent political history. The American student would probably be most attracted by the courses of A. Leroy-Beaulieu on current politics, Vandal on the Eastern question, and Bourgeois on the diplomacy of the eighteenth century, and by Sorel's excellent account of diplomatic history since 1789. Boutmy, the director, whose studies in comparative constitutional law have been so favorably received in America, does not lecture.<sup>2</sup>

If we combine the forces of the four institutions to which we have limited ourselves, it appears that there are at Paris three lecturers on ancient history, ten on medieval, twelve on modern, and three on subjects which do not belong to any single period. The relatively small amount of attention given to ancient history is at once evident. Bouché-Leclercq and Guiraud do good work, and

<sup>1</sup> The *Livret de l'École des Chartes*, published in 1891, contains a brief history of the school, accompanied by official documents, and a list of its graduates with the subjects of their theses. Current news appears in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*. The *Everyday Work of the École des Chartes* is described by W. E. Mead in the *Academy* (Boston), December, 1890.

<sup>2</sup> The school publishes each year a pamphlet giving the *Organisation et Programme des Cours*, sold at one franc. Current information also appears in the *Annales de l'École Libre des Sciences Politiques*.

are re-enforced by classical scholars of the type of Havet, Cagnat and Boissier, as well as by eminent Orientalists, but it is obvious that one whose special interests lie in the field of Greek and Roman history—if any such should some day come to light in America!—will seek instruction elsewhere than in Paris. Modern history, the field which on the whole ought to offer the greatest attraction to the American student, is well represented and counts among its professors probably the most brilliant historical lecturers at Paris; there is, however, for this period a marked absence of seminaries or “practical” courses. For the Middle Ages there is no lack of opportunity, whether in lecture, seminary, or the auxiliary sciences so necessary to the medievalist, and it is probably in this field that French historical scholarship has won its greatest triumphs and offers its largest facilities. In both the medieval and modern periods the work is rather closely limited to the history of France, obviously a greater disadvantage to the native than to the foreign student, who has little opportunity to study French history elsewhere.

The proportion of set lecture courses is smaller in France than in Germany, as the French system compels university professors to spend the greater part of their time in preparing men for the *licence* and *agrégation* and examining candidates for the bachelor's degree, so that at the Sorbonne a professor will frequently give but one lecture a week. The lectures are, however, prepared with great care, both as regards matter and form; the old type of public address in which the professor “said nothing but said it nicely” has, in history at least, quite passed away, and nothing is more characteristic of the younger generation of historical scholars in France than their horror of declamation or rhetorical padding of any sort. Indeed, their directness and simplicity and rigid exclusion of irrelevant matter compensate in some degree for the infrequency of their appearance, so that it is no rare thing for a professor to accomplish as much in one exercise of an hour or an hour and a half as most Germans succeed in doing in three or four of their shorter periods.

There is always a certain attraction in comparing the characteristics of two peoples like the French and the German, but such comparisons are apt to be superficial and misleading, especially in the world of scholarship, where national distinctions are fast tending to disappear. With all that they have gained in thoroughness and accuracy—matters for which they are largely but by no means wholly indebted to German models—French students of history have not lost their power of effective organization and presentation of material. No one could maintain that in France, where they have only in recent years been placed upon a substantial basis, historical

studies are so well organized or have produced so much good work as in Germany, but the quality will not suffer by comparison; and in the midst of the vast mass of historical publications of every sort the French have been able to preserve a juster sense of proportion in their work, as well as a certain originality and freshness of view born of contact with fields of investigation in which much still remains to be discovered. It should also be observed that the Romantic movement spent its force much more quickly in France than in Germany or England; except among the adherents of the old régime, the French manifest a sharper detachment from the past and a more objective attitude toward it than either of the other peoples mentioned. This is the result, partly of the Revolution, partly of the national lack of sentiment; while it limits the power of sympathetic interpretation, it checks the tendency to idealize the good old days and to obscure the vital distinctions between different periods; it places less emphasis upon survivals and reversions and more upon the reality of historic change. Another characteristic of historical work in France—the clerical party being of course excepted—is its marked secular character and its impatience of anything that savors of mysticism or metaphysics.

In the correlation of history with other subjects, the French universities are at a disadvantage as compared with those of America or Germany. The combination of history with geography in the *lycées* compels an artificial union of these subjects in the universities, which, while perhaps serving to call attention to an adjunct of history too often neglected, separates geography from geology and cognate studies and divorces history from its natural associates, economics and political science. Indeed, since very little instruction in social and political science is given in the *lycées* for which they prepare teachers, no regular provision is made for these subjects in the faculties of letters, and the student who desires to broaden his work in these directions must have recourse to the Law School, the Collège de France, and such private institutions as the École Libre des Sciences Politiques and the Collège Libre des Sciences Sociales—the last an interesting attempt to supplement the work of other schools by short courses in economic method and doctrine. The dangers of such a division of the social sciences, in weakening the hold of history upon the present and encouraging a purely doctrinaire treatment of economics, it is not necessary to point out.

No enumeration of the historical resources of Paris would be complete that did not include some mention of the Bibliothèque Nationale, the largest collection of printed books in the world, and the treasures of unpublished materials for history preserved here



and at the Archives Nationales, as well as at various lesser depositories, and constituting a richer body of manuscript sources than is possessed by any rival university centre. It should however be observed that in the matter of access to books the German student has, on the whole, the advantage over the French. It is not easy for an American to conquer his impatience at the vexatious delays of any Continental library, and I have certainly no desire to pose as the defender of the German system; but the majority of German libraries have at least the merit of being catalogued and of keeping their periodicals up to date and accessible, and the inconvenience of discovering that a book has been lent from a German library is certainly no greater than that of learning that the desired volume of the Bibliothèque Nationale is at the binder's or cannot be found. Worst of all, perhaps, is the fact that the seminary library, the unfailing resource of the German student and one of the greatest advantages of the seminary system, is entirely lacking to the general student at Paris. Only for the user of manuscripts are the facilities there better than in Germany.

On the whole it is the advanced student of history, and not the beginner, who will derive most advantage from a sojourn at Paris. The immature youth, who has not yet secured a good grasp of the essential facts of history, who has not received some substantial training in investigation, and who has not some clear ideas concerning the nature of historical study and the reasons why he is pursuing it—a man of this sort is ill prepared to work wisely amid the multiplicity of special courses and the manifold distractions of the French capital. Thanks to the rapid development of American universities in the past twenty years, it is no longer necessary to cross the Atlantic in order to begin one's historical apprenticeship, or even in some lines in order satisfactorily to complete it; and there can be no question that the proportion of those who pursue their entire graduate course abroad is steadily decreasing. Their place is being taken by a growing number of mature students—professors on leave, travelling fellows, newly-made doctors, and others—who desire to continue work already well begun here. During their residence abroad these men will no doubt increase their stock of historical information and learn valuable lessons in historical method, but their greatest profit will come from access to great collections of historical material, from the stimulus of contact with new teachers and new ideas, and from first-hand knowledge of the monuments of the European past and the life of the European present. To such students Paris offers a warm welcome and a wide opportunity.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

## FEATURES OF THE NEW HISTORY: APROPOS OF LAMPRECHT'S "DEUTSCHE GESCHICHTE"

FEW historical writings of the nineteenth century have met, on the one hand with such hearty welcome, and on the other hand with such passionate opposition as has Lamprecht's *Deutsche Geschichte*. But three years after the appearance of the first volume a second edition was begun, in 1894; and all through Germany the leading journals, magazines, and educated readers in general, joined in commending the new work. Public interest now-a-days is not limited to political questions alone; it is more and more occupied as well with social phenomena in various other lines. And here, finally, was a History of the Vaterland which recognized in past centuries conditions and problems like those which attract most attention at the present time. What more natural than that it should find sympathetic readers? Reviewers pointed out the importance it assigned to economic life, and discussed with enthusiasm its treatment of the evolution of the national civilization; the methods used they found to be new, the points of view modern, and therefore acceptable.<sup>1</sup> This book evidently responded to the spirit of the day. Later, however, when scholars had had time to make a detailed study of the successive volumes, appeared some of the hardest, most bitter criticism ever given to a work possessed of such dignity and of such guarantees of scientific preparation.<sup>2</sup> It was attacked on grounds, among others, of inaccuracy, of plagiarism, of wrong method, of disregard of essential facts, and of being based on entirely wrong historical conceptions. As a result there arose a conflict<sup>3</sup> of no inconsiderable proportions between Lamprecht on the one side and several representa-

<sup>1</sup> The general character of the best early reviews is illustrated by: G. Winter, *Die Begründung einer social-statistischen Methode in der deutschen Geschichtschreibung durch K. Lamprecht*, in *Zeitschrift für Kulturgeschichte*, I.

<sup>2</sup> The most noteworthy criticisms have been those by: Rachfahl, *Deutsche Geschichte von wirtschaftlichem Standpunkt*, in *Preuss. Jahrb.*, LXXXIII; von Below, in *Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXI; compare Lamprecht's answer in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, XIV. 1499; Finke, *Die kirchenpolitischen und kirchlichen Verhältnisse zu Ende des Mittelalters nach der Darstellung K. Lamprecht's* in *Römische Quartalschrift*, IV. suppl.; id., *Genetische und klerikale Geschichtsauffassung*, Münster, 1897, 38 pp.; Hintze, *Ueber individualistische und kollektivistische Geschichtsauffassung*, in *Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXVIII.; Lentz, in *Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXVII.; Blondel, in *Revue Historique*, mai-juin, 1897; Oncken, in *Preuss. Jahrb.*, July, 1897.

<sup>3</sup> This conflict forms the subject of a short article by M. Pirenne, in the *Revue Historique*, mai-juin, 1896, entitled *Une Polémique historique en Allemagne*.

tives of an older school on the other, in which the field, object, and method of historical science have been the main questions at issue, and in the course of which it has fallen to the author himself, to be the first to point out the chief aims and original features of his History.

Under these circumstances it is not the purpose of this article to add another to the already numerous criticisms of this epoch-making book. The task of testing in what measure Lamprecht has told the real truth concerning the history of his people shall be left for others. We prefer to try to bring together here in one view some of the most important lines of thought to be found in the *Deutsche Geschichte*, and in the conflict still going on over it, which are of importance to historical science in general and which may well be taken into mind by all by whom history is studied or taught. This endeavor involves a statement of the fundamental features of the work itself, and a contrasting of certain directing influences which it illustrates with those prevailing heretofore.

The first edition was sent out accompanied neither by a preface nor by an explanatory note of any kind, with the aim that the book should speak for itself.<sup>1</sup> The author was conscious, however, that its underlying idea would give offense to the older representatives of the profession, and that he could, therefore, expect a debate over the principles of historical science.<sup>2</sup> He was not disappointed, and in the course of the controversy he has taken occasion to bring to brighter light his ideas on these principles,<sup>3</sup> ideas, moreover, which form the kernel, the fundamental features of his History. Perhaps the first step toward understanding them may be taken by observing some of the paths followed in the preparation of the work in which they are embodied.<sup>4</sup>

First, Lamprecht read systematically the sources for German church history and for German history in general, of the tenth

<sup>1</sup> Lamprecht, *Deutsche Geschichte*, zweite Aufl., Vorwort.

<sup>2</sup> Lamprecht, *Alte und neue Richtungen in der Geschichtswissenschaft*, Vorwort.

<sup>3</sup> See especially: a. *Deutsche Geschichte*, Vorwort. b. *Die gegenwärt. Lage d. Geschichtswiss.*, in *Zukunft*, February 8, 1896. To this Fr. Meinecke made a short reply in the *Hist. Zeits.*, LXXVI. 530 f.; and Lamprecht answered in *Zum Unterschiede d. alt. u. jüng. Richtg. in d. Geschichtswiss.*, in *Hist. Zeits.*, LXXVII. 257 f., accompanying which is a short *Erwiderung* by Meinecke. c. *Das Arbeitsgebiet geschichtl. Forschung*, in *Zukunft*, April 4, 1896. d. *Die Geschichtswissenschaftl. Probleme der Gegenwart*, ibid., November, 1896. e. *Eine Wendung in geschichtswissenschaftl. Streit*, ibid., January, 1897. f. *Alte und neue Richtungen in d. Geschichtswiss.*, Berlin, 1896, 79 pp. g. *Was ist Kulturgeschichte? Beitrag zu einer empirischen Historik*, in *Deutsche Zeits. für Geschichtswiss.*, N. F., 1896-1897, pp. 75-150.

From a close study of the last two in particular I have drawn extensively in preparing this article. The individual references made to them in the following pages aim to indicate at least those instances where the indebtedness is most direct.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Was ist Kulturgeschichte?* pp. 127 f.

century ; from which he acquired the knowledge of an intellectual life entirely different from that of to-day. Then supplementing the information drawn from written sources by a study of the art of the same century, he found the knowledge already acquired confirmed ; also that the general psychic disposition characterizing the art of the time was identical with that of customs and literature. Wishing, now, to measure the difference between the spirit of the feudal epoch and that of to-day, it soon became evident to him that the only way to make this difference intelligible was to follow the various changes from century to century down to the present time ; therefore he extended his task to gaining a clear view of the successive, psychically different periods of the last eight hundred years of German history. Meanwhile, however, he had come to the conclusion that all these studies would remain in the air unless he followed at the same time the development of civilization on the material sides of life. The thoroughness of his researches in this direction is fully illustrated in the *Deutsches Wirtschaftsleben im Mittelalter*.

But could there be, after all, common foundations for the various classes of phenomena ? This exceedingly difficult problem was approached first in the field of *Geistesleben* ; and here, happily, certain deeper relations were found characterizing the development of art, literature, religion, customs and law. It proved that in these domains six different periods of growth can be discovered : one of symbolism, before the tenth century ; of typism, from the tenth to the thirteenth ; of conventionalism, from the thirteenth to the fifteenth ; of individualism, during the sixteenth, seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth ; and finally, one of subjectivism, since the middle of the eighteenth. And that which is common to all these periods is, that from epoch to epoch the soul-life becomes more and more intense ; its composition grows finer ; the passions become more balanced, the power of interpretation and the methods of intellectual activity more searching. Of greater importance, however, than this discovery was a second : that the stages found to be characteristic of the development of civilization on the side of purely *geistig* phenomena proved to be identical at basis with the chronological divisions in the growth of civilization on the material side of life. So, the period of symbolism corresponds essentially with the industry of fishermen, hunters, shepherds and very primitive farmers (*occupatorische Wirtschaft*) ; the epochs of typism and conventionalism respectively with two especial features of that industrial activity which rested in general on the growth first of collective, then of private property in land (*Naturalwirtschaft*) ; while individualism and subjectivism fall in likewise with two similar stages—col-

lective and individual—in that régime which exchanges and pays in money (*Geldwirtschaft*).<sup>1</sup>

Once this result was reached it became clear that all the so-called social-psychic factors must have some inner coherence; and that coherence Lamprecht tries to point out, not for the entire evolution of the German people, to be sure, but for that fragment of the general typical unfolding covered by the periods just named. It appears in the fact that this fragment of the general unfolding is tied together through its successive stages by one common, all-pervading tendency; namely, a constantly increasing intensity of the social-psychic life. *Geldwirtschaft* is a more intensive form of economic activity than *Naturalwirtschaft*. The painting of a Dürer, in the individualistic period, is more intensive than that of the miniaturists of the conventionalistic epoch; and at the same time less intensive than that of, say, Adolph Menzel in the period of subjectivism.

One's justification in arranging the periods according to the principle of a progressing psychic intensity, it is worthy of remark, need not rest on empirical grounds alone; for support can also be found in certain general psychological facts.<sup>2</sup> The principle of the creating synthesis holds for the social-psychic as well as for individual-psychic causality: namely, that the sum of a number of creative psychic activities is not identical with the product of these same activities; the product is much greater. Now when a number of social-psychic factors, in continual activity, are arranged side by side, as is the case in any normal historical development, especially in any regular national unfolding, there must arise as a result of their working a continually increasing excess of psychic energy; that is, historical life must move in a constantly growing psychic intensity.

Having indicated the main paths followed by Lamprecht toward the writing of his *Deutsche Geschichte*, we may venture next on a more inclusive and direct characterization of its distinguishing ideas.

To begin with, according to the announcement prefixed to each volume of the second edition, the author seeks to describe, by the side of political development, first of all, the development of conditions and of the *Geistesleben*; for questions of civilization, compared with those properly political, are of equal, if not of far greater importance. He promises<sup>3</sup> to make an earnest attempt to show clearly,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. further Lamprecht, *Deutsche Gesch.*, III., Einleitung.

<sup>2</sup> See page 447 in regard to the relations of individual and social psychology to history.

<sup>3</sup> "Es wird der ernstliche Versuch gemacht, die gegenseitige Befruchtung materieller und geistiger Entwicklungsmächte innerhalb der deutschen Geschichte klarzulegen, sowie für die Gesamtentfaltung der materiellen wie geistigen Kultur einheitliche Grundlagen und Fortschrittsstufen nachzuweisen." *Deutsche Gesch.*, zweit. Aufl., Ankündigung.



in the field of German history, the mutually fructifying influence of material and spirit forces of development; and likewise to explain what have been the uniform foundations for, and the steps of progress in, the united development of the material and spirit factors of civilization.<sup>1</sup> The thoughts thus stated so compactly echo the successive conclusions reached by Lamprecht in the course of preparing his History; and they bespeak the actual, fundamental features of that work.<sup>2</sup>

The regular factors in history, which find expression within the frame of national evolution, fall naturally into two broad classes: those which can be traced to the free-will impulses of individuals, and those which are imbedded in the collectivity of individuals. The first class is not subject to subdivision. It includes forces which, being directly related to some singular will, must be treated accordingly. In either lower or higher civilization, however, the activity of the individual is closely limited; whether less so in the higher than in the lower is even still a question. Whatever may be found, in particular instances, to have been the influence of a great personality, there are whole fields of history where such influence is possible only to the slightest extent; for example, those of customs, of so-called mythological ideas, of language, and in a certain sense, of law and industry. In all these directions the character of life is determined almost entirely by the psychic state of the collectivity of persons. What the individual can accomplish is little, and must first be assimilated and modified by the collectivity before it becomes a part of real historical life. In this connection arise many fruitful problems concerning the degree to which the individual's activity is assimilated, and in what measure the social body determines the activity of persons; but sure it is that strong personalities can push forward the tendencies of the psychic collectivity of a given time or in some particular place. By a specially keen understanding of the will, feelings and vague ideas of the social body, and by the power of expressing that understanding in deeds, they can assist these tendencies toward fuller clearness and wider acceptance. And they need not be slaves entirely of the drifts in the collectivity. They can contribute something from themselves.

The second class of regular factors on the contrary is subject to

<sup>1</sup> For these features, a summary of which follows, see, aside from the *Deutsche Geschichte* itself, Lamprecht's article on *Was ist Kulturgeschichte?* passim.

<sup>2</sup> The word material should not be understood as referring to dead elements of matter of any kind. It stands rather for those psychic factors of civilization which are most closely bound up with these dead elements. One can conceive of exertions, habits, ways of thinking in connection with economic activities without identifying them with land, grains, products of manufacture, mediums of exchange, and the like.

subdivision; first of all, into natural on the one hand, and social-psychic on the other. Among natural factors may be named: climate; quality of the soil; configuration of the land; features of the locality, especially relative amounts of land and water; natural scenery, and nature phenomena; flora and fauna; anthropological character, particularly the physical nature of the people. These are all constant, and contribute continuous influences toward historical variation. They may be looked upon as conditions, in the proper sense of the word.

The social-psychic factors are to be found in the content of the *geistig* habits of the collectivity of a given time.<sup>1</sup> These are not to be admitted as conditions, though they are usually spoken of in this way, but as causes in themselves (*Ursachen*) of historical growth, of that which happens; a view not new in itself but new in its application by a historian properly so called. If now one but reflects on the quantitative value of the causal capacity in the social-psychic factors, on their never-ending creating of new power, he will understand clearly enough, for the purposes of this article, in what measure they outweigh personal initiative, even that of the strongest, and how, out of their combination especially, go forth those irresistible psychic streams which rule the world. To describe these factors as they have been in any given time or place, it is not sufficient to construct a sort of mosaic, or schematic co-ordination of the different classes of facts; it is not enough to look at them thus, as a background, as passive conditions subject to handling by individuals. They are much rather to be represented as living, working forces, of strong causal capacity, and united in a never-ending, never-resting conflict.

But after all, what are these factors? How many of them are there? How shall they be described further? Indeed, to understand at all the real nature of these several factors, and to determine their number with relative accuracy, it is of comparatively little help to classify them under such names as moral, intellectual, æsthetic, religious, legal, political, industrial, and so on. Rather should each one be studied in the light of its origin and gradual development. It so happens, however, that the deeper exploration of these ground-elements in history can be carried to an end only with the aid of ethnology, psychology and physiology; for the historian himself cannot work back of the time or stage of progress at which a people begins to look upon itself historically. At present, to be sure, the results are largely provisional; but for the sake of some sort of a

<sup>1</sup>“Die sozial-psychischen Faktoren bestehen in dem Inhalt des geistigen Gesamthabitus einer Zeit.” *Was ist Kultur*. ? p. 112.

genetic, specific classification of the foundations of historical life they should be accepted as a working basis. Accordingly, as social-psychic forces of earliest origin, corresponding to will, imagination, and feeling as activities of individual *geistig* life, appear industry, consisting at first purely of a struggle to sustain the species; the simplest form of thinking, bound up with language; and the most rudimentary expressing of the feelings, the beginnings of art. Later, as the individual-psychic activities become more definitely incorporated into the social body, customs, myths and an ornamental-symbolical art are evolved; and out of these in turn gradually arise religion and morals. Finally, as remoter reflections of the original evolution-potencies,—namely, will, imagination, or representative power, and feeling,—appear law, science and the higher expressions of art.

With the exception of scientific thinking and highly developed art, all these factors show themselves at the beginning of the historical period of folk-life, and they exist in a social-psychic unity, closely bound together and at all times dependent upon each other. Heretofore it has been the custom to emphasize some particular one, and to make others of inferior importance or suppress them altogether. Many have assigned the chief position to the moral forces, others have considered the material elements as all-determining, while still another large school have found the real agent of progress to be the intellect. These views, however, are all one-sided. The world of social-psychic forces is a unity, and as a unity it must be studied and understood. There is as little right in subordinating the sum of forces to some particular one as in holding any one of them unworthy of consideration; for no one of these forces has an existence of its own. A connection arising out of the most intense acting and reacting upon each other pervades them, while at the same time the product of this inter-activity is itself subject to the influence of similar products of the past and in turn acts as a cause for the future; and therefore none of them can be left out of account in efforts to determine the character either of any particular factor or of all together at a given time.

Since the product of these factors forms a unity, it is the factors all together which vary from epoch to epoch; and their varying can be subjected to periodization. The periods as arranged for German history, have already been described.<sup>1</sup> But further, Lamprecht looks upon his arrangement of civilization-epochs not as peculiar to the evolution of the Germans; they promise to be as well, *mutatis mutandis*, the typical stages for other peoples.<sup>2</sup> It

<sup>1</sup> See pages 433, 434.

<sup>2</sup> *Was ist Kulturg.*? p. 130.

may be asked, however, what scientific guarantee is there that these are the true periods for one people, to say nothing of all. Is their succession an unalterable historical law? What value, in general, can be assigned to them? So far only empirical and psychological considerations have been offered in view of these questions.<sup>1</sup> For a more substantial answer we must examine the method employed in determining the periodization agreed upon.

In conformity with the proposition that the determination of typical, social-psychic stages of development has throughout the character of a statistical induction,<sup>2</sup> Lamprecht has employed the method of statistics. If, then, the periods of civilization he describes are those reflected in statistical tables, they are worth no more than any well determined statistical rule; they can be characterized by only such laws as the logic of the method permits; that is, rules possessing almost the nature of laws, true only in general. But these rules are not lightly to be passed over because of their incompleteness, for they have a certain specific value. In every statistical observation, one has to distinguish between the constant and the variable; he recognizes that permanent causes lie below the one, transitory under the other; and the generalizations he makes seek to express correlations among the phenomena in question, and to indicate therewith the causal connections. The method being entirely inductive, he has but to descend successively to deeper and deeper levels in order to reveal more fundamental relations, and each constant interdependency discovered is a step toward an explaining of the final, fundamental bond. Statistics, in establishing the fact of connection between phenomena, lays the foundation for search after the deeper causes of these connections. Such is the rôle of this comparative method in any field where, in the midst of complicated inter-acting forces, specific successions can be shown to exist. So in biology, there is no law known that such or such an acorn must grow into an oak tree; but under normal conditions it will. Likewise with the periods of social-psychic evolution; no people has to go through these stages, but if the development is normal each one will. In biological science men have already worked long to determine deeper causes, and to frame empirical laws. Lamprecht enters in his *Deutsche Geschichte* on similar questions for the historical field. It may be freely asserted, however, that whatever generalizations are found, whatever solutions are reached, whatever fundamental forces are revealed, the end will not be disclosed; the last cause will remain as much unseen in the his-

<sup>1</sup> See pages 434, 435.

<sup>2</sup> *Was ist Kulturg.* ? p. 133.

tory of men as it is in the history of plants and animals. Nevertheless we have the satisfaction of knowing that that which may be discovered by this path will have such value as can be imparted by pure induction ; that it will not be deduced from irrational hypotheses.

There are left now two other questions in regard to these regular factors : First, granted that they exist in a unity and in continual interdependence, can their mutual relations be more exactly stated ? If, indeed, one puts aside the theories of the older schools concerning the autocracy of intellect, or of moral or "material" forces, his first impression as to the deeper connections is that the material and *geistig* groups move along side by side without being bound into each other by any particular ties that are susceptible of direct proof ; in relations, therefore, similar to those between body and spirit, between matter and life in general—a sort of psychophysical parallel. On this view rest some occasional considerations in the first volumes of the *Deutsche Geschichte* ; but the author recognizes now that they are not tenable. The relations between the individual factors are neither so simple nor so inexplicable.<sup>1</sup>

In any given, highly complicated mass of varying inter-activities, the typical stages of development extend severally to just those limits within which may be discerned the highest level of a particular sort of civilization. The characteristic elements of the different stages, however, need not necessarily reach every part of the social body of the time. Only in the primitive ages of undifferentiated national life, when there is relative homogeneity of the mass, does it seem that this can occur. Later, on the other hand, when new elements move out as a rule from the higher classes, they can exist for centuries without reaching the entire people. So in none but a limited sense can the periods of civilization be given a chronological character, namely, according to the sway of specially characteristic factors. In certain classes of the society, psychic elements of earlier stages may live on and never yield to others. The different periods have, therefore, no distinct boundaries ; they are rather dovetailed into each other. The most ancient types live beside the youngest ; the most highly cultured have neighbors struggling only for a living.

The oldest social-psychic factors, then, must always have the strongest influence, for of them alone is it to be presumed that they pervade the whole civilized body, and that their activities—varying to be sure with the successive stages of evolution—must, since in themselves they never die, have higher and higher value as time

<sup>1</sup> *Was ist Kultur?* p. 138.



goes on. Consequently, the oldest social-psychic factors—those, that is, which are bound up in industry, in language, and in that class of general aspirations out of which art, for example, arises<sup>1</sup>—have for every epoch in history an imperishable meaning; there is no social-psychic phenomenon, of the lowest or highest degree of civilization, in which their working cannot be discerned. The earlier stages of progress they control predominantly; it is a recognized fact that then customs, morals, and law depend, far differently than in a higher stage, upon the industrial life of the time. In later periods, however, the significance of these primitive elements moves gradually into the background, not because they are weaker, but because they are hidden more and more by the advancement of certain *geistig* factors.

Finally, considerations such as these point to a second question: By what road or roads do the new products, the new elements of civilization, reach the different parts of the social body? The possibility of their gradual assimilation is to be found in the constantly progressing organization of the civilized body. Clearly the social-psychic factors do not work, in general, directly upon each other; but only indirectly, through the medium of the social organization. In a further defining of this medium,<sup>2</sup> then, lies the answer to our question.

The development of the social groups is really only another side of the differentiation of the social-psychic factors; whence it follows that the most primitive social group is that natural group bound together solely by the tie of language. Perhaps, however, just as old are the earliest industrial bonds. Gradually the *geistig* bonds come into prominence, and there appear festival associations, organizations for worship, and finally churches. These are all of primitive root, while the higher groupings in *geistig* social-psychic life, resting on common artistic or scientific possessions, belong (as complete products at least) to a time of more individualistic civilization. The typical latest formation of all the primitive organizations, and at the same time the highest, is that of the law, and for the maintenance of law the State. Moreover, since the State is the highest social organization, it is also the most general; and, where evolution is normal, appears in co-ordination with the sum of the natural group-formations, the Nation. Since the State is the last and most general organization, it includes all other groups, and has the duty of representing them outside of the nation, together with absolute power over them in so far as provision for this representing is concerned. Naturally

<sup>1</sup> "Streben nach Erhöhung der psychischen Eindrücke." *Was ist Kulturg.?* p. 140.

<sup>2</sup> *Was ist Kulturg.?* pp. 141-142.

this power extends its influence inwardly as well ; and for that reason all social group-formations strive on their side to work upon that influence just as the State is exerting itself upon them. In consequence, the State holds that central position which it takes in history : It is the medium through which all social force-strivings or tendencies act, whether these go out from itself or from other organizations.

The regular factors in historical life, then, appear and grow within the nation. They are the natural, the individual, and the social-psychic. These, however, do not constitute the whole sum of influences to which any given people may be subject ; for evolution goes on also under the working of certain general or world-tendencies. When the civilization of one nation is brought by any means into contact with that of another, there is an interchange of influences. It may be by the processes of a renaissance or by some action between peoples of the same period ; in any case historical development is largely determined in this way.

So far we have tried to point out some of the characteristic features of the *Deutsche Geschichte* ; and at the same time to bring them into the light of Lamprecht's own explanations. This has been done mainly with the hope that by such means certain ideas might be introduced and in part explained, which, though bearing ample fruit in many quarters, are apparently not yet recognized widely enough by students and teachers of history. In attempting a further exposition of these ideas it seems best at this point to extend the circle of thought so as to include a view of the essential differences between some old and new tendencies in historical work.

One of the first impressions coming from a look in this direction is, that after several decades of criticism and study of details, we are gradually coming into another period of generalization. But this does not express the fundamental changes in progress during the last two decades. There will, indeed, always be a place for critical scholarship ; under no circumstances can "the establishment of the facts" be dispensed with, nor the methods of work that have grown up with it. Historical scholarship, however, with all its machinery, and history, in the proper sense of the term, stand for entirely different things. The first is a tool, a means to an end, for the latter as well as for several social sciences. Men will never quit looking for the different bearings of known facts, among others their historical bearings ; and so trials will always be made to discern by what roads and through what experiences the world of men and of nations has come to be what it now is. The old and new tendencies, then, for which we are searching, must be only in the field of his-

tory proper. But still further limits can be set to the region where we may expect to look for them with success.

It has been the custom of late to make such distinctions as the following : Formerly there was an attempt to write general history, while now-a-days one studies nations, or one particular line, like the history of art, of religion, or of law ; formerly more attention was given to political facts, now more to economic influences ; again, idealistic conceptions have been gradually yielding to positive, materialistic views of human happenings. The last example, in particular, is not only inadequate in its explanation, but indicates besides an especially unscientific spirit. For whatever truth may be found in some of the current stock antitheses, certainly those which rest upon a difference of philosophic theory should be entirely discarded. There can be no truly scientific historical work which is inspired by such views—idealistic, positive or whatever else they may be. History is properly—though the fact is, alas, too little recognized—an inductive science,<sup>1</sup> and its progress depends not so much on the classes of facts it may incorporate or renounce from time to time, as on the degree in which it adopts, develops and applies inductive methods. From the point of view, therefore, of differences in method let us compare the old and the new tendencies.

When history had once added to its annalistic functions the duty of observing the sequence of facts, and had begun to ask after the why, it freely applied the principle involved in the question : What is the object in view ? The object was adopted as the cause. Moreover, the ends sought were always particular, individual, of concrete nature ; they led from fact to fact. It was the rule, for example, in the last century to refer that which happened, in so far as it was rationally explained at all, back to isolated, single acts. The principles of personal object and of individual psychology were applied to the whole field of human activity.<sup>2</sup> Evidently, to proceed thus is to draw all forms of causality into one class. Against this view, the idea of causality in general has been slowly gaining ground. The principle of end-in-view can clearly enough be applied as cause in a large proportion of human phenomena : those, namely, in which the action is connected especially with individual motive, is thought out, is already planned. But just as clearly is there a great proportion of human phenomena in which no particular object is involved. The individual acts, often enough, without thinking at all. There is, indeed, an immeasurable field of customary, generic happenings

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lamprecht, *Alte und neue Richtungen*, pp. 3,4.

<sup>2</sup> This point of view has now few or no defenders in theory. In practice, however, consciously or unconsciously, it is still frequently occupied.

in which, since all people act in essentially the same way where the conditions are the same, the individual factor in the deed recedes completely into the background. How explain such phenomena by the end-in-view? Rather must the causal tie, pure and simple, be here brought into service.

From these considerations it appears that the historical method may properly fall into two divisions, corresponding to two sides of historical research: one dealing with the singular, the other with the general; the one individual, the other collective.<sup>1</sup> Not that the two are ever clearly separated; on the contrary, they are always amalgamated, whether it be in the line of art—one should distinguish between the artist and the style—literature, law, industry, politics, or in any other field. But since the two methods are so generally and so closely bound up in each other, their respective limits are only the more likely to be disregarded. True, much blame has to be laid on each of them. Whatever may be said against the teleological principle, the causal certainly has at times borne down the scale too low on its side. Yet, when followed with such precautions as the very nature of the material prescribes, how endless seems the possible application! For only one condition accompanies its use: that the last determined causal relation shall be in harmony with all those previously known. The progress this principle has already made may be seen partly in the complaints of some representatives of the older school;<sup>2</sup> partly, again, and to more advantage, in the relation it holds to the evolutionary studies which form so prominent a feature of recent historical work.<sup>3</sup> In fact no one can write history from an evolutionary point of view, unless the facts can be bound together causally so that the representation of them may proceed in chains of reasoning whose several links are tied together as by necessity.<sup>4</sup> The teleological view goes from the facts back to some motive; but there is nothing absolutely necessary thus brought out, for each motive in the chain may have resulted from free-will decision. History written after this manner must be pragmatic, while the evolutionary representations, on the contrary, are

<sup>1</sup> "Individuale, eminente Handlungen werden immer durch im Sinn des Zweckbegriffes verlaufende Hypothesen miteinander zu verknüpfen sein. Handlungen dagegen und Handlungskomplexe, welche sich als einer bestimmten Lebenshaltung gewöhnlich angehörig charakterisieren, mithin generischer Natur sind, werden der Aufhellung durch Hypothesen bedürfen, die von der Annahme eines kausalen Verhältnisses ausgehen. Demgemäss treten als die beiden Seiten geschichtlicher Forschung Personen- und Lebenshaltungsgeschichte, individuelle und generische oder kollektivistische Geschichte auseinander." *Alte u. neue Richtungen*, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> The recent historical controversy in Germany furnishes several illustrations.

<sup>3</sup> See K. Breysig, *Ueber Entwicklungsgeschichte*, in the *Deutsche Zeitschr. für Geschichtswiss.*, N. F., 1896-97, pp. 161-174 and 193-211.

<sup>4</sup> *Alte u. neue Richtungen*, p. 9.

characterized by the widest possible causal conception of that which happens.

The significance of the use of purely inductive methods appears to good advantage in their application to the phenomena of constitutional law.<sup>1</sup> The practice of the older school has been to picture the conditions of a given period by systematic arrangement of particular categories of facts; and then, when the succession in time of several such social states has been shown, by the medium of juridic thinking—by a formal road, that is—to trace the descent of the different categories of later from those of earlier conditions, without considering that every single tracing of origins should have regard for the united, inter-dependent life pervading each social state. The new, evolutionary historical research, on the contrary, aims to show rather the development-tendencies lying at the basis of each particular institution. The formal garb of the institution, up to late years the preferred, almost the only, subject of study, takes a secondary place; its structure is seen clearly enough as soon as a deeper study reveals the several evolution-movements which condition that structure. The chronologically arranged pictures of the constitutional conditions give place to the representation of a permanent stream of industrial and other social transformations, whose mutual relations at any given time determine the contemporary social organization. Nor does this mean that the work of description should be given up. It will indeed always have its place, namely, to show what was developed at such and such a period; therein, however, lies only a part of the historian's mission. The evolutionary method is more intensive; it wishes to determine the real components of social life, and then to understand that life better by following the mutual relations and changes of these components.

Nevertheless, not all members of the older school have limited themselves to such work as that of the descriptivists. A considerable number of those writing from the individual, from the political point of view in the narrower sense, have tried to go to the root of things, to show what essential factors have been at work in history, and to refer that which happens to their activities and mutual relations. The most notable of these in the present century is the great master himself, Ranke; and to this day he seems to be the patron saint of a widely extended cult. If, now, we follow his disciples to their shrine of shrines and study their innermost thoughts, the difference between the earlier and the later tendencies will appear still more striking.

Without attributing to Ranke any particular philosophical sys-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lamprecht's review of Inama-Sternegg's *Deutsche Wirthschaftsgeschichte*, II., in the *Jahrb. für Nationalökonomie und Statistik*, 1895, LXIV. 294 ff.

tem, it can be said that his historical thinking centers fundamentally about two points,<sup>1</sup> an idealistic view of the world, in the sense of the *Identitätsphilosophie*, and a universalistic conception of history, essentially in the sense of the cosmopolitanism of the classical German literature.

He was conscious of a God who is hidden to the world but who at the same time fills it all; a God whose relations to us are mystical, not to be understood by the reason. He manifests himself in man; the actions of man are determined by a mysterious Being; so, further, the products of human action are manifestations of that Being. All history is at basis a divine mystery. The world of everyday life with which we stand in immediate relation and to which the reason can be applied, is one of appearance, not the real world.<sup>2</sup> Closely associated with these views is his idea of universal history. In the actions of men, and of nations or states, must be found that which is general. The actors must all be studied to discover in what degree they express divinely originating powers which work through them. Individual, nation and state are agents of a world movement; and in so far only do they form the real material of history. Such, in brief, are the general hypotheses of Ranke's ideology. Furthermore, the mediating powers—those, that is, which while acting in the world are connected in some mysterious way with God—are the “ideas” which Ranke was always telling about. They are “the objective ideas,” “the higher potencies,” “the powers born in the elements and holding them together,” “the general ideas that bear in themselves the life of the human race,” “the powers of the living *Geist* which move the world from its foundations;” they “have in them that which is divine and eternal;” they are “the thoughts of God in the world;” “they are life-giving, are life itself, are moral energies;” “though not to be defined, they can be perceived;” “they unfold, take their place in the world, come forth in the most varied forms, combat, limit and overcome one another. In their acting and reacting upon each other, their succession, their life, their passing away and coming again, lies the great secret of history.”

It is hard to detect here much of the scientific spirit of to-day. No matter how high the value ascribed to Ranke, he remains the child of another age. To him the phenomena of the historical world are not explainable through forces inherent in its being and activity; for him the task does not consist in characterizing, always

<sup>1</sup> Compare, for this discussion of Ranke, Lamprecht's *Ideenlehre und die Jungrankianer*, and the references there given; No. II. in *Alte und neue Richtungen*.

<sup>2</sup> “Der Welt der Wahrheit steht eine Welt des Scheins gegenüber, die auch in die Tiefe geht und immer tieferen Schein entwickelt, bis sie in die Wesenlosigkeit ausgeht; jene endet im Wesen.” Ranke, *Gesam. Werke*, LIII.–LIV. 570.



more closely in consequence of ever more intensive research, the expressions of these forces, and in tracing them wherever possible to simple inherent unities—finally back to a few agents. To his mind the aim of science is not the unification of the elements of knowledge, but rather the determination of a large number of special movements, each of which results from the action of some particular “idea.”<sup>1</sup> Moreover, be the reasons what they may, on the eve of the twentieth century there are still circles of influence where, to a greater or less degree, Ranke’s way of thinking prevails. Frequently enough one reads of the *geistig* factors as the only working forces; of the others as conditions, pure and simple. Notwithstanding great discoveries in causality, in the world of *Schein*, teleological proofs still flourish. But against this irrationalism rises, stronger each year, an entirely different spirit. “I can very well think of a world,” says Lamprecht, “one part of which appears to me as intelligible, while another part I must characterize as non-intelligible; under the condition that the problems of this latter are to be solved in the future, even if a late, perhaps endless future.”<sup>2</sup> Further, as for general history, to the modern school the Rankian point of view is unthinkable. Some time one may be able to make trustworthy generalizations in the universal realm; but for the present historical research, like that in the natural sciences, is more intensive and applies itself especially to national development, in the hope of discovering there the simplest components of historical life. It holds that the fundamental elements do not consist of the actions of eminent persons, nor of the deeds of states as such; but rather of those factors which, taken all together and in their varied mutual relations and transformations, form the *Kultur* of the time. It sees the general currents moving along in a succession of periods of civilization. It seeks the typical stages which appear regularly in the unfolding of each nation, and looks upon the different peoples as bound together in world-history by a network of influences between the civilization of the various nations in their typically recurring stages of evolution. Each folk will receive from others into its own current those factors which it is at the given period able to assimilate, and may even bring that which it receives to higher perfection.

In view of the foregoing statements, two prominent tendencies are to be observed in the historical science of the last few generations. One of these, that of the older school, may be called individualistic, descriptive, political, since its representatives have been especially those who maintain that the political field is the proper one for history. Its essential characteristics imply an emphasis of

<sup>1</sup> *Alle u. neue Richtungen*, pp. 43-44.

<sup>2</sup> *Alle u. neue Richt.*, p. 73.

eminent persons, of the state, and of man in general. The other, that of the younger school, now rapidly advancing, is collectivistic; while recognizing the part played by individuals, it emphasizes first of all the activities of natural associations, the highest being that of the nation-state. Have we noticed clearly enough, however, what are the real foundations of the differences between these schools, and whether the one method is not, after all, a complement of the other?

It seems to be pretty well agreed that psychology must be taken as the basis of historical science, in fact of all the *Geisteswissenschaften*, in much the same way as mathematics is for the natural sciences.<sup>1</sup> But this being so it follows that the progress of these sciences depends in large part on the progress of psychology. Just here lies the explanation for which we are seeking. The old psychology, in so far as it was empirical, was individual psychology; it looked upon man in general as a great abstract individual, the folk as a sort of mechanical aggregate of persons. Out of it grew the theory of the social contract. On such ground rested historical writing in the days of Schlosser and Ranke; and in many respects that of the older school, though often unconsciously, perhaps, still rests upon it. The individual with them is the main subject of research; and some even go so far as to say—Schäfer,<sup>2</sup> for example—that only the persons of special importance are, properly, to be considered. The new psychology, on the other hand, has taken an entirely different attitude; more and more it has turned toward generic research; and while the explanation of the simpler psychic phenomena may still be left to the old method, the solution of many especially involved problems is, in part at least, sought through social-psychic studies.

With this change are brought to light new fields for historical research; new causal relations can be established, and an evolutionary record drawn up. For it appears that just as a consciousness of a harmony differs from that of the different tones composing it, so when a greater or less number of human beings feel something, think something in common, the feeling or thought of all together is different from the sum of individual feelings or thoughts that enter into its composition. In each case the product of the whole includes something qualitatively new. In the one instance we call it harmony, in the other it may be, for example, public opinion, or patriotism. Given this law and its operation on society, it is clear that every social organization must be constantly creating a certain product over and above the sum of the activities it embraces, and in so far we have to reckon with a factor in social-psychic causality for

<sup>1</sup> Compare *Was ist Kultur?* pp. 77–87, and the references there given, especially those to Wundt and Paulsen.

<sup>2</sup> *Geschichte und Kulturgeschichte*, 1891, p. 60. Compare also his pamphlet on *Das eigentliche Arbeitsgebiet der Geschichte*, 1888.

which individuals in themselves are not responsible. Why call such factors supernatural? Why class them as irrational "ideas?" Moreover, is it not evident that in dealing with social formations the historian must recognize forces in reference to which the value of any one person is identical with that of his associates; that to the extent to which individuals unite in producing one of these social-psychic elements, they are regular, typical? But at the same time, also, irrespective of their typical value, shall he not credit at least many individuals with historical significance of their own? In truth, not all consent to the view indicated; there are those still who see at basis the singular, not the regular. The common nature of all scientific work should be kept in mind. By analysis we determine the characteristics of each object or phenomenon; by synthesis we try to bring data into their proper relations, to discover their associations, their causal connections. The natural sciences began earlier to practise sane synthetic thinking, and so are far advanced to-day. For historical science to adopt it with the same heartiness does not necessarily mean to adopt the methods of natural science; it means, rather, adopting the true methods of science in general. The so-called collective school are seeking now the evolutionary, causal relations; they are trying to synthesize. But there is plenty of room for the individualists as well. Whatever the rational has not yet conquered, must be subjected to further analysis; and especially in the realm of purely individual free-will activity, the descriptive workers can find ample opportunity to supplement the results of synthesis.

To summarize briefly, the new history takes into account all the activities of man as a social being; political phenomena are neither the only facts to be considered, nor the state the element for which alone all others exist. It recognizes as the essentials in historical life certain natural, individual and social-psychic factors, whose nature, transformations and mutual relations form the civilization of any given time. The new history—and herein lies its really fundamental feature—holds to the principle of describing the human past from the point of view of rational evolution. It asks not "*Wie ist es eigentlich gewesen?*" but "*Wie ist es eigentlich geworden?*" It aims to go as near the beginning as art or science can tread; and studies to find the typical stages of development for each nation, together with the currents of life running between the different peoples. By adhering strictly to inductive methods, it hopes to trace at last just how the world of men and of nations has grown into what it is to-day and so to put into the hands of philosophy trustworthy, scientific conclusions.

EARLE WILBUR DOW.

## DID CABOT RETURN FROM HIS SECOND VOYAGE?

THIS important question of maritime history acquires additional interest from a document recently discovered in the archives of Westminster Abbey.

It is well known that John Cabot, by virtue of letters patent granted to him and his three sons by Henry VII., equipped a small vessel, and with a crew of eighteen men, sailed from Bristol in the spring of 1497, to make discoveries "in whatever part of the world heretofore unknown to all Christians." He landed somewhere on the northeast coast of the new world, and returned home after an absence of only three months. That is the origin of the regal title of England to the greatest part of North America.

As John Cabot was believed to have discovered Cipango and the Kingdom of the Great Khan, he found no difficulty in obtaining letters patent for a second expedition. Early in May, 1498, the bold navigator sailed again westward, leading a small fleet of five ships. In July following, news was received in London that one of the vessels had been forced by stress of weather to put into Ireland. That is the last that was ever heard of John Cabot's second and last voyage.

He had a son, called Sebastian, who arrogated to himself the merit of the achievement and lived and prospered, in England as well as in Spain, to an extreme old age, upon this mendacious boast. Nay, during several centuries nearly every one believed that he had been the sole discoverer of Labrador, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and Canada, although authentic documents tend to prove that he was not even on board when these discoveries were made.<sup>1</sup>

Regarding the second voyage, historians, as a rule, positively asserted that it had also been accomplished by Sebastian Cabot. Thus Biddle taught that John Cabot died shortly after the patent of February 1498 had been issued, and, besides, that so far from being a seaman, he only "followed the trade of merchandise;" George Bancroft asserted that John Cabot had made no voyage whatever under the second charter; while Mr. D'Avezac maintained that Sebastian took the place of the patentee, apparently owing to the latter's "unexpected death."

<sup>1</sup> Warden's Accounts of the Drapers' Company of London, from March 1st to April 9th, 1521.

It was in vain that attention was called repeatedly to a series of facts showing that John Cabot actually sailed in command of the second expedition ; as, for instance, that he was the sole grantee of the new letters patent ; that several times he explained in person to trustworthy witnesses his plans for the second voyage ; that two ambassadors, on July 23, 1498, each sent a dispatch stating that the " fleet had sailed with another Genoese like Columbus," and we know from preceding letters that it was their manner of designating John Cabot ; that when relating the mishap which had occurred to one of the ships, they added : " the Genoese *has continued his voyage*," etc. What else could be desired to prove his having sailed and commanded the expedition in 1498 ? Yet, certain writers continued to repeat that Sebastian, not John, was the sole commander of the fleet ; and so lately as July last, the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava, in an elaborate memoir, also stated that " before the expedition was ready John Cabot died, leaving the new adventure to be prosecuted by his son."

Nevertheless one historian at least could be found to maintain that John Cabot had been the real chief of the second as well as of the first expedition, although unable to say whether the bold navigator survived it or not. A Bristol compiler, however, recently argued at length that John Cabot and his companions had possibly been exterminated by Alonso de Hojeda. Unfortunately for that fine hypothesis, Hojeda remained permanently in Spain from June 11, 1496, until May 18, 1499 ; whilst Sebastian Cabot, who is alleged to have been on board, and must therefore have shared the pretended sad fate of his father, was yet flourishing in England sixty years afterwards.

Immediately upon John Cabot's arrival in London, August 10, 1497, he received from Henry VII. a gratuity of £10 "to enjoy himself," and on December 13 following "an anuel rent of £20, to be had and yerely perceyued from the feast of thanunciacion of our lady last passed during our pleasur of our custumes and subsidies comying and growing in our poort of Bristowe by thands of our custums there for the tyme beyng at Michelmas and Estre by even porcions."

According to the terms of this annuity, John Cabot was entitled to receive £10 September 29, 1497, April 15 and September 29, 1498, March 31 and September 29, 1499, respectively, if alive at those dates. Considering that the English Public Record Office contains the most complete collection of state archives in the world, the Rolls House was, naturally enough, the first source to consult to ascertain whether there were traces of payments made on account of

Cabot's pension, to whom and when. But ill-luck will have it that the records of the reign of Henry VII. are extremely scanty. State papers for the period scarcely exist, and the Issue Rolls cease between 1479 and 1597. The only substitutes are the Tellers' Rolls, but they lack details, not being final accounts, and contain no special dates for the entries. They are all classed merely under Easter and Michaelmas terms.

That series, together with the Warrants for Exchequer Issues, were nevertheless duly examined in 1895, for the years 1485-1520. The investigation, ably carried on by Mr. M. Oppenheim, to whom the historical student is indebted for such excellent works as *A History of the Administration of the Royal Navy*, and *Naval Accounts of the Reign of Henry VII.*,<sup>1</sup> resulted in the discovery of an important document. This is a warrant of Henry VII., issued February 22, 1498, ordering that Cabot's annuity should be paid without further delay. It recites that having been "enformed that John Caboote being delaied of his payment because the customers of the poorte of Bristowe have no sufficient matier of discharge for their indempnitie to be yolden at their accompt before the Barons of the Eschequier," the king orders that several "tailles" of £10 each be levied and delivered to John Cabot.

Interesting as that document was in itself, it did not throw any light on the question which historians had most at heart to solve, as they knew already that John Cabot, in February 1498, had not yet sailed out on his second voyage. Only the accounts rendered by the collectors of the customs and subsidies of Henry VII. in the port of Bristol, for the last two or three years of the fifteenth century, could enlighten us as regards the question whether John Cabot had collected his pension after July 1498. But where was that class of documents to be found? Did they even still exist?

Last year one of those accounts came to light. It covered the period from September 29, 1497, until April 15, 1498, and showed that within that period, *i. e.*, between February 22, 1498, and Easter following, "John Calbot (*sic*) a Venetian, late of the town of Bristol," had received £10 of his annuity of £20 a year. This showed only that John Cabot was yet in England before April 15, 1498, a well-known fact. The document would have proved of some utility only if its editor had disclosed the place where the original was preserved, so as to enable others to initiate more thorough researches. But he thought fit to be as reticent on that point, as he has been regarding the books or book from which he took twenty-five important documents without a particle of acknowledgment.

<sup>1</sup> Publications of the Navy Records Society, London, 1896.



Historians were therefore again at sea. But a gleam of light appeared when, on the 24th of June last, the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava replied to the toast of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, on the occasion of the Cabot quatercentenary in Bristol. His Lordship then announced that a hitherto unknown record relating to the now vindicated navigator had been discovered by Mr. Scott, of the British Museum. It was as follows :

“Bristoll Arthurus Kemys et Ricardus A. Meryk Collectores Custumarum et Sudsidiorum Regis ibidem a festo Sancti Michaelis Archangeli anno tredecimo Regis nunc usque idem festum Sancti Michaelis tunc proximo sequens reddunt computum de £1,226, 7s., 10d.

“Etiam in thesauro in una tallia pro Johanne Caboot, £20.”<sup>1</sup>

“Bristol. Arthur Kemys and Richard a Meryk, collectors of the king’s customs and subsidies there, from the feast of St. Michael the Archangel, in the thirteenth year [of the reign] of this king, to the same feast next ensuing, render this account of £1,226, 7s., 10d.

“In the treasury, in one tally, for John Cabot. . . . £20.

His Lordship added: “The passage I have quoted does not say much.” It meant on the contrary a great deal, as, to all appearances, the record was no less than the long-sought documentary proof not only that John Cabot had not been massacred by Hojeda, nor died at sea, or before the expedition set out, but that he had safely returned to England, even prior to September 29, 1498.

This announcement greatly whetted the appetite of inquirers, who were anxious to see it confirmed by other accounts of the kind, which at the same time could enable them to ascertain when the pension had ceased to be paid. The document was said to have been found “in the Westminster Chapter-house muniments, No. 12,243.” Those who live abroad imagined that this referred to the Westminster Chapter-house public records, now removed to the Public Record Office, Chancery Lane. But these, it seems, do not contain any evidence that John Cabot received anything on account of his pension after May 1498.<sup>2</sup>

At last there has just appeared in Bristol a work<sup>3</sup> containing three records which apparently settle the main point at issue, viz. : the return of John Cabot to England.

The first document in that sumptuous and useful publication,

<sup>1</sup> London *Times*, June 25, 1897, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Better results might be expected perhaps from the Close Rolls, which contain varied and valuable information on nearly every subject.

<sup>3</sup> *The Customs Roll of the Port of Bristol, A. D. 1496-1499*. Translated from the original manuscript recently discovered at Westminster Abbey, by Edward Scott, M. A., Keeper of Manuscripts in the British Museum. With an Introduction relating to the entries of the Royal Pension paid to John Cabot, Navigator. By Alfred E. Hudd, F.S.A. Published by William George’s Sons, Bristol, 1897. Large folio, 9 leaves, 3 of fac-similes.

which, however, might have been more learnedly edited, is the Custom Roll from Michaelmas, 1496, to Michaelmas, 1497. John Cabot at the latter feast (September 29, 1497) had been in England seven weeks, after his return from his first voyage, yet his name does not figure in the account. This is owing to the fact that the pension, which had been made to date back from the feast of the Annunciation of that year (March 25, 1497), was granted only December 13, 1497, and did not pass the seals before January 28, 1498.

The second document is the Custom Roll from Michaelmas, 1497, to the same feast in the year following, viz. : from September 29, 1497, to September 29, 1498, and contains the full text of the record cited by Lord Dufferin. In a list of thirteen entries, Cabot occupies the fifth place, in these terms :

"In th[esaurari]o<sup>1</sup> in vna tall[ia] p[ro] J[ohann]e Coboot (*sic*)... xx li."

That is :

"In the treasury in one tally for John Coboot..... £20."

Strictly speaking, Cabot should have received then, not £20 only, but £30, as his pension dated from March 25, 1497, and, as we have just seen, the first payment did not and could not figure in the preceding account.

This document shows that two terms of Cabot's pension were paid ; but were they paid to him in person ? That is the gist of the question.

The collectors exhibit only as a voucher for their disbursement a "tally." But what was a tally in those days ? Externally it was, as everybody knows, a small piece of wood cleft into two parts, both cut with corresponding notches. One of the two sticks was kept by the debtor, the other was given to the creditor, as an evidence of the settlement. Madox<sup>2</sup> describes the tally as follows ; "The summ of money which it bore was cutt in notches in the wood by the *Cutter* of the Tallies, and likewise written upon two sides of it by the *Writer* of the Tallies. . . . A notch of such a largeness signified M l. ; a notch of another largeness, C l. ; of another size, xx l. &c. It being thus divided or cleft, one part of it was called a Tally, the other a Countertally. And when these two parts came afterwards to be joind, if they were genuine, they fitted so exactly that they appeared evidently to be parts the one of the other." This

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the abbreviated form "*In tho*" should be spelled out "*In thesauro*," not "*In thesaurario*." If so, the meaning of the above entry might be : "Paid in treasure (or cash) £20, attested by a tally to the account of John Cabot." There are entries, I am told, in the Pipe Rolls in support of such an interpretation.

<sup>2</sup> *The History and Antiquities of the Exchequer of the Kings of England*, London, 1711, pp. 709-710.

statement is made on the authority of the *Dialogus de Scaccario*. Madox adds: "Tallies, as well those that were made out at the Exchequer as those which were used in *pais* [therefore in Bristol], were wont to have a superscription importing of what nature they were and for what purpose given."

This constituted, until it was completely abolished in 1826,<sup>1</sup> the common way of keeping government accounts in England, and, at a certain time, everywhere else in Europe. The old tallies were destroyed in 1834; so that there is now scarcely a specimen left of those archaeological slips of wood.

Withal, the term applied also to vouchers which were entirely of a different form. Thus, ordinarily, Mr. Oppenheim says,<sup>2</sup> in payment of an exchequer warrant, the money would be handed over and a receipt taken. That receipt, when customers settled their accounts, would momentarily be exchanged for a real tally in the Tally Office, then remitted in the Exchequer Chamber next door, and, although a mere slip of paper, was called likewise a "tally." Provincial receipts in writing went also frequently by that name.

Tallies were received as evidence in courts of justice, but they do not imply necessarily that the payee received his dues personally. We notice in those accounts payments made in 1496, 1497 and 1498 to Sir Thomas Lovell. Is it likely that this personage, who was Chancellor of the Exchequer, went every year to Bristol to collect £100 or £200 in person? Yet the entries where his name occurs all state, as in Cabot's case: "In thesaurario in una tallia." This leads one to believe that the amounts were received at Bristol by the agent of Sir Thomas Lovell. As to the wooden tally itself, we must infer that it was handed to the latter in person, by the king's chamberlain or treasurer, very much as if it had been what we call a cheque, drawn on Kemys and Meryk. If so, there is no reason why John Cabot might not have received his tallies in the same manner.

But during the summer of 1498 John Cabot was certainly at sea. May he not, before starting, have empowered an attorney to receive the tallies in London, with instructions to forward them to his wife, who then resided in Bristol? Better still, could not the king's chamberlain or treasurer have sent the tallies<sup>3</sup> directly to Kemys and

<sup>1</sup> Tallies were abolished by the statute 23 Geo. III. c. 82, but not until "the death, surrender, forfeiture or removal" of the two chamberlains of the exchequer, and they did not resign till 1826.

<sup>2</sup> See also in his *Naval Accounts*, the note, page 8.

<sup>3</sup> Tallies were not necessarily given one only at a time, it seems, for in the warrant of Henry VII., February 22, 1498, I read: "We wol and charge you that ye our Treasourer and Chambrelaines . . . do to be levied in due fourme ii several tailles every of them conteynynge x li . . . and the same taill or tailles . . . ye delyver unto the said John Caboote."

Meryk, to be remitted to and collected by herself during Cabot's absence, for the maintenance of the family? On the other hand, there are innumerable instances in the Tellers' Accounts of payments made "to A. B. for C. D." or "to A. B. by his servant C. D." Yet, as I am informed, that does not prove that the form was not sometimes omitted. It must also be stated that tallies could doubtless be discounted in London; yet, when paid to the broker by the customers, I assume that the entry in the account was made in the name of the original grantee.

It follows from what precedes, that the tallies mentioned in the Westminster Abbey documents do not in themselves prove the personal presence of John Cabot either in London or in Bristol at the dates specified in the accounts. They are only what lawyers would call *prima facie* evidence of the fact.

The third document, showing a similar payment made between September 29, 1498, and September 29, 1499, evidenced also by a tally, is liable to the same objection, which, however, is more than counterbalanced by the following facts:

The first Cabotian voyage lasted from the beginning of May to the first week in August, 1497, which shows that such a voyage could be accomplished in three months. Cabot, the second time, sailed from Bristol early in May, 1498. He might have been absent five months and yet have returned home in time to collect his pension before the end of September following. It is therefore nowise impossible that John Cabot should have collected his pension personally in Bristol, or received his tallies in person at the hands of the king's treasurer in London, before September 29, 1498, and in 1499.

Further, that was the time when he was expected back in England. Dr. Puebla, the Spanish ambassador, in a dispatch to Ferdinand and Isabella, undated, but sent from London in July, 1498, speaking of the sailing of the five ships of the second expedition, says: "Dicen que seran venidos para el Setiembre:—They say that they will be back in September (next)." Pedro de Ayala, the joint ambassador, in another dispatch, dated London, July 25, 1498, also writes: "Sperase seran venidos para el Setiembre:—It is hoped that they will have returned in September."

The Bristol accounts, examined by the light of these facts, strongly tend to prove, therefore, that John Cabot did return from his last voyage before September 29, 1498, and that he was still living after the latter date.

HENRY HARRISSE.

## THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE BALLOT IN ENGLAND

IN the long agitation which preceded the adoption of the English Ballot Act in 1872, it seems to have been assumed by both the reformers and their opponents that the ballot had never been used in England for the election of public officers. Secret voting was denounced as un-English, as a pernicious innovation and a poisonous exotic. Eminent writers, like Bentham, Ricardo, Mill, Grote, and Macaulay, who advocated the reform, did not retort by appealing to English precedent; they sought their precedents in remote ages or in foreign lands, especially among the Greeks and Romans, or in France, Italy, America and Australia. Moreover, within the past few years certain historians have positively asserted that the ballot was unknown in England before 1872,<sup>1</sup> and upon this assumption one of these writers has based some sweeping conclusions regarding the origin of American institutions.<sup>2</sup> It can, however, be demonstrated that secret voting was known in England during the Middle Ages, and that the ballot, though not the most prevalent form of voting, was in common use in various boroughs of England from 1526 to 1835.

An interesting monograph might be written on the history of municipal elections in England. Some of the methods of voting in medieval and modern times were curious and instructive. In our age of zealous office-seekers we should remember that for centuries office-holding was regarded as a burden; that the election originally determined upon whom an irksome duty was to be imposed. This doubtless helps to account for the use of rotation and lot in making nominations or in electing officers in many boroughs.<sup>3</sup> Aversion to office-holding should also be taken into account in considering how other old methods—such as indirect elections by various sets of

<sup>1</sup> D. Campbell, *The Puritan in Holland, England and America* (1892), I. 51-52, II. 430; C. F. Bishop, *History of Elections in the American Colonies* (1893), 156.

<sup>2</sup> Campbell, *The Origin of American Institutions, as illustrated in the History of the Written Ballot* (Amer. Hist. Assoc., Papers, V. 163-186); *The Puritan in Holland*, etc., I. 47-53. During the discussion which followed the reading of Mr. Campbell's paper at the meeting of the American Historical Association, Professor Jameson asserted his belief that the ballot was used at an early date in the English municipalities.

<sup>3</sup> Gibson, *History of Cork*, II. 179-183; Turner, *Oxford Records*, 290-1; Palmer, *Perlustration of Yarmouth*, I. 71; Swinden, *History of Yarmouth*, 492; *Munic. Corp. Com.* 1835, II. 1092, 1101, 1274, *et passim*.

electors<sup>1</sup> and voting by acclamation<sup>2</sup> or by a show of hands<sup>3</sup> or by asking those in favor of a candidate to go to one side of the room<sup>4</sup>—managed to take firm root in England. There is, moreover, some evidence which indicates that elections formed a potent factor in the creation of the “select bodies” of certain towns.<sup>5</sup> These matters we are not at present prepared to investigate; we wish merely to prove that the ballot existed in England long before its general introduction in 1872.

Already in the fourteenth century there was secret voting in some boroughs. At Lancaster, in 1362, those who participated in the election of the mayor were ordered to “give their voices privily and secretly every one by himself.”<sup>6</sup> According to an ordinance made at Norwich in 1415, each voter was to go to the polling officers and “secretly” name the person whom he desired to be mayor.<sup>7</sup> In 1416 it was enacted at Lynn Regis that each of the twenty-four jurats should “secretly declare” his vote for mayor, and that the common clerk should “secretly write down the wishes of each in this respect.”<sup>8</sup> According to an act of Parliament of the year 1471, each voter at York was to go to the polling officers, “ipsisque secrete inter se narrabit quem. . . majorem habere voluerit.”<sup>9</sup> When more town records are published, it would not

<sup>1</sup> For example, at Cambridge, from 18 Edward III. to 10 Elizabeth and from 1786 to 1835, the mayor and “his assessors” named one person, and the commonalty named another. These two elected twelve of the commonalty, and these twelve chose six more of the commonalty. The eighteen then elected the mayor and other officers. (*Munic. Corp. Com.* 1835, IV. 2185.) Again, at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, according to a royal charter of 1345, the mayor and the four bailiffs were to elect seven men, and these twelve were to choose four, who were to choose eight. The twelve (8+4) were to elect twelve others, and these twenty-four (12+12) were to elect the town officers. (Brand, *History of Newcastle*, II. 161-2.) These methods, which in divers forms were very prevalent in England, may have been suggested by the machinery employed in naming the old presentment jury of the hundred and the jury of the Grand Assize.

<sup>2</sup> For example, at Deal, Dover, Faversham, Norwich, Oxford, St. Albans and Waterford. See *Munic. Corp. Com.* 1835, II. 931, 942, 963; Blomefield, *History of Norfolk*, III. 127-8; Turner, *Oxford Records*, 397; Gibbs, *St. Albans Records*, 8; *Hist. MSS. Com.*, X., pt. v, 281.

<sup>3</sup> At Thetford, for example. See *Munic. Corp. Com.* 1835, IV. 2541.

<sup>4</sup> At Woodstock, from 1580 to 1664, the mayor was elected as follows: The Corporation nominated two aldermen. Then the commons or freemen were summoned, and the mayor said: “Those that will gyve their voyces to thone alderman stande of that syde, and those that will gyve their voyces to thother alderman so nominated stande on the other syde.” (Ballard, *Chronicles of Woodstock*, 33-34.) See also Gribble, *Memorials of Barnstable*, 347; Gibbs, *St. Albans Records*, 8; Noake, *Worcester in Olden Times*, 146.

<sup>5</sup> *Rotuli Parl.*, VI. 431-2; *Materials for the Reign of Henry VII.*, II. 456-7; Merewether and Stephens, *History of Boroughs*, 231, 907.

<sup>6</sup> Simpson, *History of Lancaster*, 277.

<sup>7</sup> *Evidences relating to the Norwich Town Close Estate*, 37.

<sup>8</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com.*, XI., pt. iii, 198.

<sup>9</sup> *Rotuli Parl.*, V. 455.



surprise us if they should reveal the employment of the ballot in England during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

That the ballot was well known in London in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is demonstrated by the following entries in the records of the Court of Aldermen. In 1526 it was ordered that "in all matters concerning the election of aldermen, etc., which need to be written and tried by way of scrutiny, such matters shall be tried by the new gilt box, brought in by the chamberlain, whereon is written these words, 'Yea,' 'Nay.'" In 1532 it was ordered that "in every matter of gravity the box shall be brought into Court, and by putting in of white or black peas the matter is to take effect or not." It is evident that the bean ballot was not an invention of the Puritans of New England.<sup>1</sup> The medieval records of Italian cities mention a *scrutinium cum fabis albis et nigris*.<sup>2</sup> In 1642 the Court of Aldermen enacted that "from henceforth the balloting box shall be used in this Court, as formerly, to declare their opinions and resolutions in special matters to be propounded."<sup>3</sup>

That the ballot was in vogue in England during the seventeenth century is shown by a royal order in council dated September 17, 1637. Taking into consideration the manifold inconveniences that may arise "by the use of balloting boxes, which is of late begun to be practised by some corporations and companies," the king declares his "utter dislike thereof," and, with the advice of his council, orders that no corporation or company within the city of London or within the kingdom shall in the future use such boxes.<sup>4</sup> We are not informed why Charles I. tried to abolish this practice, but we know that the king controlled the elections in many boroughs, and that those who voted contrary to his wishes were in danger of being expelled from the civic corporations.<sup>5</sup> The ballot-box, which fostered a spirit of independence among the voters, had "manifold inconveniences" for monarchs who wished to retain their control over

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Milton, *Free Commonwealth* (*Prose Works*, 1851, III. 438): "to convey each man his bean or ballot into the box." Mr. Bishop (*History of Elections*, 168) believes that the bean ballot of Pennsylvania was borrowed from Massachusetts. It seems more plausible to assume that the practice in both colonies was derived from England.

<sup>2</sup> *Statuta Communis Parmae*, A. D. 1266-1304 (Parma, 1857), 52, 54.

<sup>3</sup> For these three entries, see *Analytical Index to the Remembrancia of the City of London* (1878), 27.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 27; *Macmillan's Magazine*, XX. 567. On the same day an order of the king in council prohibited the Merchant Adventurers from using a ballot-box. (*Cal. of State Papers, Domestic Series*, 1637, p. 420.) In 1622 the names of the candidates for the offices of treasurer and deputy of the Virginia Company "were balloted" or "put to the balloting box." Balls were used in balloting. See *Abstract of Proceedings of the Virginia Company of London*, ed. R. A. Brock (Richmond, 1888-89), I. 178.

<sup>5</sup> Bailey, *Transcripts from the Archives of Winchester*, 31; Merewether and Stephens, *History of Boroughs*, 1716.

the "select bodies." The intimidation of voters by the king or by his agents could not be continued effectually under a system of secret voting.

The following interesting ordinance was made at Winchester in 1656:<sup>1</sup>

"Whereas it hath been found by often experience that public and open votes at the assemblies holden within the said city, for electing of the mayor and other magistrates and officers within the same, hath caused clamour and ill blood amongst divers of the citizens of the city aforesaid, for the preventing whereof in time to come, and to the end that the said citizens may be more free in their votes and elections than formerly they have been, and for the better continuance of love and unity amongst themselves, It is ordained and established by this assembly that there be forthwith provided one hundred bullets, of colours red and white, in equal proportion, and that the said bullets be kept in a fit box to be provided for that purpose. And that at all such public assemblies and meetings one of the said bullets be delivered to each citizen then present, and that the mayor for the time being (if occasion be) do declare in writing, under his hand, for what person or purpose each of the said bullets shall stand at every nomination or election; and that, instead of such open and public vote, each citizen put privately into said box the bullet for or against such person or purpose then in question at such nomination or election, according to the dictates of his conscience; and that the mayor put in two bullets for his casting vote (in case the bullets so put in, as aforesaid, shall happen to be even); and that, upon view of the said bullets, the election to pass, stand and be determined, according to the major part of the bullets, for or against such nomination, or election, or purpose as aforesaid, and to be as effectual to all intents and purposes as if the same had been openly and publicly voted, any ordinance or custom to the contrary thereof in anywise notwithstanding; and that the bullets remaining in each citizen's hand be immediately after each election privately put in again into the said box. Provided—that it shall and may be lawful to and for any citizen, if he think fit, openly to publish and make known his vote, and to declare the reasons and inducements leading him thereunto."<sup>2</sup>

Here we find at an early period the principle of optional secret voting, which was advocated by the House of Lords in 1872, but which the Commons refused to accept.<sup>3</sup>

During the seventeenth century balls or bullets were also used in elections at Lymington and Barnstaple. In 1577, in order "to prevent animosities," it was ordained at Lymington that the mayor and the members of Parliament should in the future be elected "by the way of bullets." Three candidates were nominated for mayor,

<sup>1</sup> The ordinance has this rubric: "Election of mayor and all other officers to be by pewter."

<sup>2</sup> Bailey, *Transcripts from the Archives of Winchester*, 31-32.

<sup>3</sup> For optional secret voting at Rochester, see below, p. 462.

and then each burgess received three bullets of different colors. One of these he deposited in a covered box; the other two he put "privately" into a bag provided for that purpose. This method of election seems to have been abolished after a short trial.<sup>1</sup> In 1689 it was enacted at Barnstaple that, after the names of two candidates for the mayoralty had been fixed on two separate pots, each voter should receive a ball and, holding both hands closed, should "at one instant time" put his right hand into one pot and his left into the other, "letting his ball fall secretly into which pott he list." This method of voting for mayor and other municipal officers was still in practice in 1830;<sup>2</sup> and the ball ballot is still employed in Greece at the present day.<sup>3</sup>

The secret *written* ballot also existed in English towns. To terminate the "infinite contentions, animosities, and disputes" among the burgesses of Pontefract, James I. in 1607 granted them a new charter regulating the election of mayor. Each burgess was to write on a scroll of paper the name of the candidate for whom he wished to vote, and this scroll was to be placed in a box or bag. When the result of the election had been declared by the town clerk the scrolls were to be publicly destroyed, in order that the handwriting might not be scrutinized.<sup>4</sup> In 1835 this method of voting was still in use not only at Pontefract, but also at Queenborough.<sup>5</sup>

Another means of securing secrecy was by a scratch, or dot, or other mark opposite or under the name of the candidate. At Wisbech in the early part of the present century, the names of the persons nominated for the office of capital burgesses were pasted upon a piece of paper, and each voter made a tick or scratch under the names of those whose election he desired, no person being allowed to see the poll except at the time of voting.<sup>6</sup> A similar system seems to have been in vogue at Chippenham, Fordwich, Kingston-upon-Thames, and Plymouth.<sup>7</sup> At Chippenham the voters signified

<sup>1</sup> *Munic. Corp. Com.* 1835, 743-4.

<sup>2</sup> Gribble, *Memorials of Barnstaple*, 351-4. Balls were also used at Portsmouth, Doncaster, Romsey and Yarmouth. See below, pp. 461, 462.

<sup>3</sup> G. Deschamps, *La Grèce d'Aujourd'hui* (new ed., 1897), 85-86. The Venetian mode of balloting advocated in Harrington's *Oceana* has striking resemblances to that which still exists in Greece. In 1268 the written ballot was used in Venice. See H. P. Lrown, *Venice* (1893), 151.

<sup>4</sup> Boothroyd, *History of Pontefract*, 447-8, and App. p. xii.; Fox, *History of Pontefract*, 33-34.

<sup>5</sup> *Munic. Corp. Com.* 1835, II. 824, III. 1674-5.

<sup>6</sup> *Report from Select Committee* (Parl. Papers, 1833, Vol. XIII., p. 172); *Munic. Corp. Com.* 1835, IV. 2552-3.

<sup>7</sup> *Munic. Corp. Com.* 1835, II. 987, 124, IV. 2895; Worth, *Calendar of Plymouth Records*, 85. At Kingston-upon-Thames, in 1835, the names of the candidates were written upon a sheet of paper, to which each voter went alone and "scratched" the name of one of the candidates with a pen. This system of voting existed at Kingston for at least three hundred years.

their choice for the office of bailiff by sticking a pin in the name of one of the candidates. This calls to mind Sydney Smith's description of the plan proposed by Grote in 1836-37: "In Mr. Grote's dagger ballot box . . . you stab the card of your favorite candidate with a dagger."<sup>1</sup> In the reign of Charles II. the Earl of Shaftesbury advocated the adoption of the "dot system" for parliamentary elections. The method, he says, should be such "that none may know on whom the electors' votes were conferred. . . . Let them go in one by one, each writing down his own dot."<sup>2</sup>

At Portsmouth, in the first half of the present century, "scratching" and the ball ballot were combined. Each person went separately into a room and made a mark opposite the names of those aldermen whom he wished to nominate for mayor. The two having the most marks were nominated. Each elector then received two colored balls, one of which he "privately" placed in a box and the other in a bag.<sup>3</sup>

The employment of the ballot for the election of public officers is first mentioned in the *Statutes of the Realm* in an act of 1831 (1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 60). It provides that, in those parishes of England and Wales which shall adopt the act, the vestrymen and the auditors of parish accounts shall be elected by a written ballot, if this be demanded by any five rate-payers.

Other examples of the use of the ballot, from 1722 to 1835, are briefly indicated in the following list:

BOSTON. Election of the common council, 1835: *Munic. Corp. Com.* 1835, IV. 2152.

DEAL. Election of jurats and common councilmen, 1815-1835: *ibid.*, II. 932.

DONCASTER. All elections shall be determined by ballot with balls, 1778. Tomlinson, *Doncaster*, 334.

DROGHEDA. Election of mayor, 1835: *Munic. Corp. Com.* 1835, Ireland, 813.

LINCOLN. A proposal to substitute *viva voce* voting for the ballot was rejected, 1749: *Hist. MSS. Com.*, XIV., pt. viii, 117. Election of aldermen by ballot, 1835; *Munic. Corp. Com.* 1835, IV. 2346.

LYNN REGIS. Election of committees "by lot or ballot," 1835: *ibid.*, IV. 2396.

<sup>1</sup> *Works of Sydney Smith* (2d ed.), III. 141. Mr. Grote's plan was to use a card-frame covered with glass. Under this glass the voter sees a card on which the names of the candidates are printed. Through one of the holes in the wood he punctures the card opposite the name of his favorite candidate, and then by pulling a slide causes the card to fall into the ballot-box. See *Spectator*, February 25, 1837.

<sup>2</sup> *Somers Tracts* (1812), VIII. 402.

<sup>3</sup> *Munic. Corp. Com.* 1835, II. 803-4. Black balls were used to indicate a preference for the senior alderman, white balls to indicate a preference for the junior alderman.

READING. All elections in the Corporation shall in the future be by ballot, 1722: *Hist. MSS. Com.*, XI., pt. vii, 205.

ROCHESTER. According to a by-law of 1734 regulating the election of mayor, the town clerk and four others are the vote-takers, and the town clerk writes down the votes on papers, which are publicly burned as soon as the result of the election is declared. A vote-taker who reveals how anyone has voted shall be disfranchised, and prosecuted for perjury. At the expiration of two hours of secret polling those who prefer to vote publicly may do so. *Munic. Corp. Com.* 1835, II. 845.

ROMSEY. Election of mayor and recorder by ballot with colored balls, 1835: *ibid.*, II. 1331-2.

SOUTHAMPTON. Election of mayor, circa 1760 to 1835: *ibid.*, II. 874; Davies, *History of Southampton*, 165.

STOCKPORT. Election of mayor and town clerk, 1820, 1836: Heginbotham, *Stockport*, II. 260, 274.

SWANSEA. Election of portreeve, 1835: *Munic. Corp. Com.* 1835, I. 386.

YARMOUTH. Election of aldermen and common council by ball ballot, 1725-1835: Palmer, *Perlustration of Yarmouth*, I. 73-74; Palmer, *History of Yarmouth*, 50.

The Municipal Corporations Act (5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 76) prescribed open voting for some of the most important town offices,<sup>1</sup> and tended to make all municipal elections uniform.

The history of the ballot in England has not yet been written; this paper deals tentatively with only one phase of the subject. The town records which have been published are not yet abundant enough to enable us to make an exhaustive study of such institutions. The meagre sources at our disposal indicate that in some boroughs the municipal officers were elected by ballot since the sixteenth century; that this mode of voting was seldom used for parliamentary elections before 1872;<sup>2</sup> and that balls were usually employed in balloting, though we meet with some examples of written scrolls and "scratching," and in many cases the kind of ballot is not described in the records. It is difficult to determine whether secret voting in olden times prevented bribery and intimidation. The motive for its introduction which is most frequently mentioned was to prevent animosity, clamor and disorder.<sup>3</sup> The attitude of Charles I. toward the institution seems to indicate that already in the seventeenth century it tended to guarantee the personal independence of

<sup>1</sup> The voting papers for councillors were to be signed by the voters.

<sup>2</sup> The election of members of Parliament at Lymington (above, p. 459) is the only example that I have found.

<sup>3</sup> This advantage of secret voting is also emphasized in the tract entitled "The Benefit of the Ballot" (*State Tracts privately printed in the Reign of King Charles II.*, London, 1693, I. 443-6).

the voters. We may surmise that, though the order in council of 1637<sup>1</sup> was not effective, the opposition of royalty was a potent force which in many boroughs tended to prevent the adoption of the ballot as a part of the machinery of local government. The court influence would naturally be exerted most strongly against secret voting in parliamentary elections; and this may account for the fact that we find so few examples of its use in such elections.

The fact that the ballot was well known in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries suggests the conclusion that the American colonists brought the idea of secret voting with them from their English homes. In 1835 a member of Parliament asserted that the advocates of the ballot were trying to "deck themselves out in the worn-out garments of the Americans."<sup>2</sup> His opponents might well have answered that those garments had been imported from England. The facts which we have presented also show that too much credit has been ascribed to Harrington as the progenitor of the ballot in England and America.<sup>3</sup> We have seen that this mode of voting was familiar to Englishmen a century, at least, before Harrington's time; and the question of its employment in Parliament had been agitated long before the *Oceana* was published.<sup>4</sup>

CHARLES GROSS.

<sup>1</sup> Above, p. 458.

<sup>2</sup> *Parl. Debates*, 1835, XXVIII. 420.

<sup>3</sup> Dwight, *Harrington* (in *Polit. Science Quarterly*, Vol. II.), 13-17, 21-22; Bishop, *History of Elections*, 167.

<sup>4</sup> *Journals of Commons*, 1646, IV. 690: "The question was propounded, whether it shall be referred to the Committee lately named, to consider of a Balloting Box and the Use of it; and to present their opinions to the House." This question was decided in the negative. On May 3, 1660, it was ordered that twelve members be chosen by ballot to carry the letter of the House to the king (*ibid.*, VIII. 11, 15; *Hist. MSS. Com.*, V. 149). Mr. Goadby, in *Polit. Science Quarterly*, III. 657, says that the earliest recorded use of the ballot in connection with the English Parliament occurs in 1805. The truth is that the written ballot was frequently employed in both houses for the appointment of parliamentary committees, from 1690 onward into the nineteenth century; the voting papers were held between the finger and the thumb, and were put into glasses. That no mention of this practice occurs in the journals of either house from 1660 to 1690 was perhaps due to the revulsion of feeling against liberal thought during the reigns of Charles II. and James II. Mr. Goadby also seems to err in stating that a ballot bill was introduced in the House of Commons in 1710 (*Polit. Science Quarterly*, III. 656), and his error has been repeated by Campbell (*The Puritan*, II. 431).



## THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE KÖNIGSMARK QUESTION

A STRIKING example of what modern historical methods and especially the tracing back to their sources of long-accepted assertions, can do towards unravelling past mysteries is furnished by some recent researches of Schaumann,<sup>1</sup> of Köcher<sup>2</sup> and of Horric de Beaucaire<sup>3</sup> in the matter of the once famous intrigue between Count Philip Königsmark and Sophia Dorothea, electoral princess of Hanover. Not that all, or even nearly all has been explained; we are as much in the dark now as to what became of the unfortunate Swede who suddenly vanished forever on the eve of the day when he was to have run away with the young wife of the future George I., as were the friends and relatives who so persistently demanded an investigation at the time. But the whole matter has been shown to have a far broader significance than was ever before imagined; the steps that led to the catastrophe have been carefully followed one by one, and evidence has been found which throws a new light on the terrible punishment meted out to the erring princess—the common ancestress of two famous lines of kings—who for thirty years or more was kept in almost utter isolation.

Interest in the fate of this pair, Königsmark and Sophia Dorothea, has never abated from their own time to ours. At short and almost regular intervals works purporting to contain the most surprising revelations have been given to the world. The climax was reached in 1845 with the appearance of two stout volumes of memoirs which were said to have been found in the prison-house of Ahlden after the princess's death; included in the publication was a full account of the whole tragic episode written by a lady-in-waiting, Fräulein von Knesebeck, who was known to have played an important part in the affair.

Various shorter accounts, based on these new sources, have since found their way into print; the latest of them, entitled "The Story of an Unhappy Queen," appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* in 1892. A single sample is worth quoting literally as an excellent

<sup>1</sup> *Sophie Dorothea und die Kurfürstin Sophie*, Hanover, 1879.

<sup>2</sup> *Die Prinzessin von Ahlden*, in *Historische Zeitschrift*, XLVIII. 1-44, 193-235.

<sup>3</sup> *Une Mésalliance dans la Maison de Brunswick*, Paris, 1884. See also for this article Vols. IV., XXVI., and XXXVII. of the *Publikationen aus den Preussischen Staatsarchiven*, containing memoirs and letters of the Electress Sophia.

illustration of the kind of story that has long found credence with regard to this matter. The explanation given of Königsmark's disappearance is that the Countess of Platen, mistress of the Elector Ernest Augustus, out of jealousy for spurned affections, and by a false use of the electoral princess's name, decoyed the count into an ambush in the Hall of Knights of the castle at Hanover and watched behind a curtain while the assassins did their work.

And now like a serpent from out its hole emerged the fiend who had planned this ghastly revenge, unwilling that her quondam and worthless lover should expiate his crime and that she should not witness his agony . . . "The princess is innocent," he murmured as the ferocious woman stood quivering with hatred, rage and black revenge over his dying form ; and while he was still muttering his expiring testimony to the innocence of her for whom he suffered, she raised her foot, encased in its high, wooden-heeled shoe and, placing it on his mouth, she stamped out his last expiring breath.

This same writer, who professes to have obtained her information from an undoubted authority on the secret histories of the Hanoverian court, asserts that the vindictive husband, the man who was later George I. of England, caused the heart of his dead rival to be taken from his body and burnt, the ashes being placed in a footstool which the prince used to the end of his life and which still exists.

Thankful indeed should we be to the men who by diligent search and by means of the sharpest constructive as well as destructive criticism have at last given us a basis from which to proceed and have broken asunder a whole chain of previously accepted testimony. Schaumann and Köcher especially, the latter of whom is at present in charge of the Hanoverian state archives, have furthered our knowledge in three different ways ; they have sifted and sorted every scrap of manuscript evidence that still survives, they have entirely established the untrustworthiness of all former authorities, and they have brought the Königsmark episode itself into a clearer relationship with what went before and what came after.

That the actual amount of extant manuscript material is so slight is now known to be due to the preconcerted policy of the heads of the house of Hanover. They were determined that no written records on this matter should remain. The Electress Sophia implies this in her letters to her niece, the Duchess of Orleans, who was her chief confidante. She seldom mentions the Königsmark affair, but when she does it is, so to speak, with bated breath and with a warm injunction to destroy the letters and to let no one know that the information came from her. The Hanoverian archives themselves

bear the strongest testimony to the plan of suppression and destruction; documents and letters for the critical months are missing from collections otherwise intact; pages are torn out of the covers in which they once belonged. Almost all the contemporary testimony that we now have came later into the archives with the family papers of deceased persons or with the acts of legal or ecclesiastical tribunals. The most curious by far of all the bits of evidence is a series of remarks scribbled by the lady-in-waiting, Fräulein von Knesbeck, on the furniture and walls of the room at Scharzfeld where, for three years after the catastrophe, she was kept in confinement for having aided and abetted the princess in her attempt at flight. Being allowed neither pen nor pencil she had made use of the charred coals with which her warming-pan was filled. She escaped at last and an attested copy was at once made of all that she had written, while at the same time an account was rendered of various utterances let fall by her during the term of her imprisonment.

Not by any means the least interesting result of the work of the Hanoverian investigators is their proof of the utter falsity of Sophia Dorothea's memoirs and of Fräulein von Knesbeck's journal. Even on the surface, indeed, the memoirs bear the stamp of improbability; they are written in dialogue form, the characters have their exits and their entrances, and the plot is unfolded as in a regular drama. No one with the least conception of the real character of the unfortunate electoral princess, who had accepted her incarceration as a just penance for the scandal she had caused, could ever have considered her capable of this elaborate working-out of the trying incidents in which she had played so important a part. Yet the calm assurance with which the work was published and the positive manner in which false statements were made, caused the whole to be received as a serious contribution to historical literature.

The simplicity of the means by which these memoirs, as well as the journal of the lady-in-waiting, have been proved to be arrant forgeries is without a parallel in the history of criticism. Both of these writings, and indeed almost all the publications that have ever appeared on the subject of Königsmark's relations to Sophia Dorothea, are found to have been based on a novel of the period. Not only have the incidents been thus borrowed, but in many cases the actual language. Even in the attenuated form in which the narrative has been handed on by the writer in the *Nineteenth Century*, whom I have quoted above, I have been able to find traces of verbal agreement with the extracts from the original given by Köcher.

Not that the novel which has given rise to this century-long deception was by any means an ordinary one. The author, Duke Antony Ulrich of Wolfenbüttel, was the cousin of the princes of the house of Brunswick; his son had once been affianced to Sophia Dorothea but had fallen at the siege of Philipsburg in the war against Louis XIV. It was a passion with Antony Ulrich to write romances of interminable length in which incidents and personages of his own day, though clothed in classic garb, should be clearly recognizable. The Königsmark episode is found in full in the sixth volume of a work known as *The Roman Octavia*, which was published in 1707—some thirteen years after that July night on which the real tragedy must have taken place. Sophia Dorothea appears under the thin disguise of the Princess Solane, Fräulein von Kneesebeck is Sulpitia Praetextata, while the Electress Sophia is “the incomparable queen Adonacris.” The scene is laid alternately at the courts of Polemon (George William of Celle, the father of Sophia Dorothea) and of Mithridates (the first elector of Hanover, Ernest Augustus).

While acknowledging, what is indeed indisputable, that the *Roman Octavia* has hitherto been the prime source of our information concerning the incidents with which we are dealing, certain critics have nevertheless tried to enter a plea for the general trustworthiness of the Duke of Wolfenbüttel. He was a warm friend of the house of Celle and remained intimate with its members even after the contemplated union by marriage was frustrated by his son's death; it was to his protecting arms that the proposed flight of Königsmark and Sophia Dorothea is said to have been directed. Yet, as a matter of fact, he knew no more of the actual truth in this present instance than did his contemporary the Duke of St. Simon, who, writing at Paris at the time, gravely asserted that Königsmark had been seized by the electoral prince and thrown alive into a hot oven. Antony Ulrich's own letters<sup>1</sup> prove that he was informed of nothing, while one or two statements in the *Roman Octavia* which can be accurately controlled show a total perversion of the facts and a tendency to be as hateful and malicious as possible towards the court of Hanover. What his general reputation as a romancer was is proved by a remark of the Electress Sophia, who on hearing an infamous slander against the Duchess of Celle—a statement to the effect that the lady in question, who was the daughter of a marquis, would once have been glad to marry a valet of the brother of Louis XIV.—declared at once that here was something to rejoice the heart of Antony Ulrich.

<sup>1</sup> Printed in the appendix of Beaucaire.

After sifting, as I have said, all the authentic sources of information and after proving that the greater part of the literature on the subject is a mere tissue of lies and imaginings, Schaumann, and, supplementing him, Köcher, went on to show that the Königsmark affair is not to be treated as an isolated episode, but that the attempted flight was the inevitable outcome of the scornful and chilling policy pursued through a long course of years by the house of Hanover towards the women of the house of Celle. I now ask leave to direct the reader's attention to the reasons for that policy, to a brief narrative, in fact, of what led up to the desperate resolve of one who might soon have been England's queen, to leave husband and children and to fly in the company of a man with an international reputation for profligacy.

In order to understand the true sequence of events it is necessary to revert to the time when Sophia of the Palatinate, the later electress of Hanover and acknowledged successor to the throne of England, was first of a marriageable age. She was daughter of that Frederick who had found the crown of Bohemia such a crown of thorns at the beginning of the Thirty Years' War—of a king, therefore, albeit a fugitive one. Her mother was the daughter of James I. of England, so that on that side, too, the proudest blood in Europe flowed in her veins. Her hand was sought in various directions and the friends of the young Charles of England, the later King Charles II., made efforts so pertinacious on his behalf that at last, wearied by their importunities and intrigues, and thoroughly disinclined to the match after the affairs of Charles I. had begun to grow desperate, Sophia left her mother's court at the Hague and took up her abode with her brother at Heidelberg. It was here that she met the attractive but dissipated Brunswick prince, George William of Celle; fresh from a struggle with his Estates, who had represented to him in the strongest terms the necessity of settling down and living among them and of ceasing to squander his revenues in foreign lands, he asked for the hand of the young princess. As the palatine elector approved of the match a formal engagement was entered into and the young duke continued on his way to the carnival of Venice. There, however, determined to take advantage of the last flitting hours of liberty, he indulged in such inordinate excesses that his health was seriously undermined and his physicians declared him unfitted for matrimony. Thoroughly grieved at the position in which he had placed his intended bride and willing to make any sacrifice in order to right the wrong that he had done, he proposed an arrangement that was accepted as satisfactory by all parties concerned.

By family compact it had been agreed that the lands of the duchy of Brunswick-Lüneburg should never be divided into more

than two parts. Of these two parts at the present time George William held one and an older brother the other ; the youngest of the family, Ernest Augustus, had little to live upon and little to look forward to save the succession to the bishopric of Osnabrück, which, by the terms of the Peace of Westphalia, was to fall to him at the decease of the existing Catholic incumbent. To this brother, then, George William made the proposition that he should marry Sophia, promising to provide amply for his present needs, to pronounce him successor to all his estates and, lest an heir should be born to contest his rights, to sign a solemn engagement himself never to marry. Sophia, who cynically remarks in her memoirs that all she desired was a suitable appanage, consented to this arrangement, allowed the preparations for the wedding to be hastened forward, and, before she had been long a bride, found herself devotedly attached to the man she had married and very contented with her lot. Her letters at this time show her to have been a remarkably intelligent woman, with keen powers of observation and an inexhaustible fund of humor. The newly married pair went to live at Hanover with George William, who for their benefit built an extra wing to his palace. "It is the holy Trinity that governs here," writes Sophia to her brother in her sprightly but not always reverent style ; but the intimacy in time became inconvenient, for George William learned the worth of the prize he had rejected, and Ernest Augustus became absurdly jealous of his brother. Sophia tells us that when he took a nap in the afternoon he would keep his feet upon her chair lest she might escape and join George William. She herself was most discreet ; she rejoiced heartily when the vacancy of Osnabrück gave herself and her husband an excuse for moving thither, and apparently more heartily still, when George William became enamored of Éléonore d' Olbreuze, the daughter of a rather obscure French marquis. Sophia and Ernest Augustus did everything to throw these two together, invited the d' Olbreuze to Yburg, their charming palace near Osnabrück, and finally promoted a union which was not even a morganatic marriage but merely a contract of fidelity with certain provisions for Éléonore's maintenance. The lady took the name of Madame de Harburg, and in course of time bore to George William the child whom we already know under the name of Sophia Dorothea.

For a number of years things ran on smoothly and Madame de Harburg, by her gentle persistence and her really strong character, managed completely to regenerate her husband and at the same time greatly to better her own position. As her daughter neared a marriageable age her hand was applied for by the son of the Duke



of Wolfenbüttel. In order to render such a union possible an appeal was made to the Emperor, who, grateful for the aid of George William against the French, declared Sophia Dorothea legitimate and worthy to wear the arms of the house of Brunswick. Soon rumors became rife that an actual wedding was to take place between George William and Éléonore; the latter was raised to the rank of Countess of Wilhelmsburg, and finally of duchess. George William still meant to keep the promise to his brother as to the succession and constantly affirmed this intention both in private and in public—but whether he would stand fast should a son be born to him was a matter open to grave doubt. There had meanwhile been a readjustment concerning the family estates. The eldest and the third brother had died, the lands were redivided, George William became duke of Celle and Ernest Augustus succeeded to the duchies of Göttingen, Kalenburg and Grubenhagen with the capital of Hanover. The desire for George William's estates had only grown stronger with these changes, for now there was a fair prospect of uniting into one great duchy all the scattered family lands. It may readily be perceived with what feelings the Duchess Sophia regarded the successes of Éléonore d'Olbreuzé; mild, at first, and even flattering had been the judgment passed upon her, but now there are no bounds to the withering contempt which the lady of royal birth feels for the presumptuous parvenue. She is the "duchess of last week," she has false teeth, she would fain have married a valet; as "that creature" she is referred to in Sophia's letters. And the young Sophia Dorothea, too, comes in for her share of vituperation; we are told that "her father makes her sleep in his own room since her goings on with young Haxthausen."

With surprise, indignation and disgust, at first, Sophia learned from her husband that he, worried about the future of his children, had given ear to a proposition from the court of Celle for a marriage between Sophia Dorothea and their own eldest prince, George Louis. But the mercenary spirit soon gained the upper hand with the duchess as well as with Ernest Augustus. Although the original terms offered were extremely favorable, the latter haggled for years for an increase of dowry. The following is what Sophia writes to her brother on the subject:

For some time now from Celle they have been offering 50,000 écus in sovereignty and 100,000 down if Ernest Augustus will consent to the marriage of my eldest son with the daughter of George William. The marriage is repugnant to the boy as is the d'Olbreuzé connection to us . . . . These considerations make it only fair that they should raise the amount. What should you think if they were to give 80,000 a year

to Ernest Augustus ; *ought he to contaminate his ancestors for that ?* They offer besides that the whole army and all the officers in the fortresses shall swear allegiance to Ernest Augustus, and that the whole land shall do him homage and promise to obey only him, even in case George William should have sons. All that won't make it any more agreeable for me to be "brother and boon companion" to a *scoupette*.

Woe to the future of a marriage contracted on such cold-blooded terms ! Sophia Dorothea, aged only sixteen, is handed over to a man so taciturn that his own mother complains bitterly of the impossibility of drawing a word from him, and so cold that his cousin, the Duchess of Orleans, maintained that he could turn everything around him to ice. Yet the poor victim herself, according to a society paper of the day,<sup>1</sup> was handsome, witty, very lively, well read and endowed with much imagination, besides dancing well, singing and playing the harpsichord. Her portraits in the Guelph Museum at Herrenhausen, and in the Radziwill collection in Berlin, show her to have had a pink and white complexion and brilliant black eyes. At the time of her marriage Leibnitz wrote a poem in which he speaks of her "divine beauty." It is possible that she was sometimes indiscreet in her conduct ; indeed at the time of a visit to Italy in 1685 there was much talk about attentions she received from two or three Italian princes ; yet so strong was the tendency to malicious slandering on the part of her proud relatives at Hanover that all stories to her disadvantage must be received with caution.

Count Philip Königsmark first enters upon the scene some six years before the great crisis occurred. He was present at a masked ball given in Hanover in 1688 and was evidently on familiar terms with the highest personages. Ernest Augustus made him colonel in his army, a post which, at the time of his disappearance, he was about to exchange for the office of general in the service of the elector of Saxony, at whose court his sister, the notorious Aurora, was already living. That his attentions to Sophia Dorothea were very marked is attested by an anecdote scrawled by Leibnitz, by way of correction, on the margin of an anonymous pamphlet that appeared at the time on this subject. During an alarm of fire at the opera house Königsmark cried out in great agitation, "Save the electoral princess !" Amid the smoke and confusion he himself seized hold of the Electress of Brandenburg, Sophia Dorothea's cousin, but on finding his mistake most ungallantly left her in the lurch. The electress twitted Sophia Dorothea on Königsmark's devotion, but her remarks were so ill received that a quarrel ensued which was not made up for two years.

<sup>1</sup> The *Mercure Galant*.

Nothing further is known, now, until the time of the catastrophe. On the night of July 1, 1694, Königsmark left his place of lodging and never came back. Ernest Augustus at once caused his apartments to be sealed up and took possession of his papers; all persons who had in any way served as intermediaries between the count and the electoral princess were imprisoned and their letters examined. The existence of some far-reaching intrigue was established beyond a doubt; utterances of ministers at various state conferences that were immediately held prove conclusively that political complications of the gravest sort played a part in the affair. What they were it would be idle now even to attempt to conjecture. So much alone is known, that at this moment Ernest Augustus had many bitter enemies among minor German princes, who were filled with envy and jealousy at his elevation to the rank of an elector; the times were dangerous, for Louis XIV. was at war with the Empire and the Brunswick brothers had done good service against him. It may be that Königsmark was a traitor or a spy; his general bad character, of which there is ample evidence, lends color to the assumption.

Sophia Dorothea's relations with her husband had long been strained; he was notoriously unfaithful to his marriage vow, but, on the other hand, had certain unknown grievances against her which led him shortly before the time of the frustrated flight to threaten her with divorce proceedings. She for her part had fled to her father and had implored him to let her stay with him, a request which George William had refused.

Whatever the mysterious plot may have been in which the flight was to have played a part, the discovery of it was ascribed almost universally by contemporaries to the Countess Platen, mistress of Ernest Augustus. She was believed to have taken summary vengeance upon Königsmark, her motive being variously stated as jealousy of Sophia Dorothea and anger that the count would not marry her own daughter. Sophia Dorothea herself must surely refer to the Countess Platen when she says in one of her rare letters: "I tremble if Count Königsmark is in the hands of the lady whom you know, lest his life may be in danger."

After the seizure of the compromising documents of which Leibnitz said at the time, "they would never have believed her so guilty at Celle if her letters had not been produced," Sophia Dorothea was first relegated to the lonely castle of Ahlden in her father's territory and afterwards, in order to be near the consistory that was to pronounce her divorce, was temporarily removed to Lauenau on Hanoverian ground. At this juncture we come upon

a series of authentic records of the very highest interest ; proceedings of the ecclesiastical tribunal appointed to pronounce the divorce, which were discovered in the reign of George IV. among the papers of the descendants of one of the judges ; records of ministerial conferences between the courts of Celle and Hanover, as well as private letters of the ministers. *Pour sauver les apparences*, as is repeatedly stated, it was decided to leave Königsmark's name entirely out of the question. The charge against Sophia Dorothea was simply and solely desertion of her husband. Every stage in the trial is known now to have been characterized by incredible deception and duplicity ; it seems impossible that the revelations which were dreaded would have referred simply to the princess's relations with the Swedish count. Interviews were frustrated, the counsel for the defense was instructed to fall sick on the day of the trial, while even before the proceedings began the wording of the final verdict had been carefully arranged by the ministers, although some members of the divorce tribunal were not in the secret. Sophia Dorothea, thoroughly humbled and penitent, allowed herself to be instructed as to every response she was to make when questioned by any of the judges. She wrote and signed exactly what she was told to, with the single exception that she could not be brought to declare herself actually guilty of conjugal infidelity. It was a most delicate matter to treat with her, for only on the basis of her guilt could such a divorce be obtained as the court of Hanover wished. Above all things it was desired to prevent her from bringing a counter-charge against her husband, for in that case the tribunal could not have accorded to him and forbidden to her the right of marrying again. On this point the courts of Hanover and Celle came into sharp conflict, but the Hanoverian influence finally prevailed. As the guilty party Sophia Dorothea could not marry again, and—for there was the point at issue—her lands and her riches, save the amount reserved for her support at Ahlden, remained in the hands of the house of Hanover. The end was achieved for which, twelve years before, the obnoxious marriage had been contracted.

How far was she really guilty ? To this day she has her advocates and accusers, but to my mind the protocol of her first interview in the matter of the divorce with the ministers of Hanover and Celle offers conclusive evidence that at the time of her entering into the intrigue with Königsmark she was a hunted woman, driven to desperation by a systematic policy of scorn and neglect. The object of the interview, the protocol tells us, was to inform the princess that everything was fully discovered, and that denials and evasions would be of no avail ; also to tell her what account of the

affair was to be made public, what she also would have to say publicly, and how she would have to conduct herself as regarded the intended separation. She showed the greatest penitence in the world, in fact thoroughly condemned herself and acknowledged that she had merited everything that had been done to her and more too. She asked for forgiveness and showed great confidence in the generosity of the elector, but seemed to fear the electoral prince. She wished to deny having actually committed crime, acknowledging, however, that the appearances were so against her that nobody could fail to condemn her and that her innocence in this regard could only serve for her own inward satisfaction. She denied also that Königsmark had ever been at night in her chamber. Her faithful lady-in-waiting, Fräulein von Knesebeck, in season and out, even when imprisoned and threatened with torture, made similar assertions, acknowledging an intrigue so dangerous that she had begged her mistress to discharge her and had only been persuaded to remain by her tears and entreaties, but denying stoutly any criminal relations between Sophia Dorothea and Königsmark. The princess was resigned to the separation, the protocol goes on, recognized that it could not well be otherwise and was of the opinion that the scanty friendship, nay more the aversion which the prince had felt for her for several years was the cause of all her misfortunes. She did not think that she could ever again set herself right with him. He had said to her before going to Berlin, "such constraint is unbearable. I shall write to your father and demand a separation." It was not likely that recent events would have changed his mind. The ministers had only to tell her what to do and she would follow their advice. She considered it a fortunate fate that was to withdraw her from a world she had loved too well and give her an opportunity of thinking on God and her salvation. As, heretofore, she had given nourishment to scandal, so in future she hoped to furnish an example of piety.

Plain it is that the coldness and aversion of Prince George, that repugnance to the alliance of which his mother had spoken and in which she so fully shared, that old disdain for everything concerning the d'Olbreuze connection, was the key-note of the whole tragedy. It had driven Sophia Dorothea into courses that, according to the sentiment of the time, needed a long and terrible expiation. It must not be forgotten that the age was one of absolute despotism; but a year or two before, at this very Hanoverian court, Count Moltke, for aiding a younger son of Ernest Augustus to oppose the latter's law of primogeniture, had been put to death; a generation later the same punishment was to be meted out to young

Katte, the friend of the future Frederick the Great, for conniving at a flight the consequences of which might have been somewhat similar to those in the case of Sophia Dorothea.

That the unfortunate princess felt chilled to the marrow by her surroundings is attested by her feverish haste, after all was discovered, to leave Hanover for the lonely Ahlden; that no charitable thought moved anyone of the electoral house is shown clearly by the comments in their letters. The Duchess of Orleans, the foster-child, as it were, of the Electress Sophia, calls Sophia Dorothea a "cursed beast," and discourses on the foolishness of women who object to their husbands' mistresses and think they themselves have a right to retaliate in kind. A fortnight after the fatal first of July the electress writes to her niece, discusses some approaching gaieties, declares that the electoral princess will not be there to claim precedence over the Princess of East Friesland and that the electoral prince, who is still in Berlin, diverting himself admirably, unconscious as yet of what has happened, will have to console himself in common with many other heroes.

Unpitied, evidently considered much more guilty than she really was, Sophia Dorothea went into her long exile. She was allowed an income befitting her rank and might even drive out over the Lüneburg Heath if accompanied by a mounted guard. No one obtained access to her presence save by a special order of the governor of the castle; a little heap of the permits that he issued is still to be seen in the Hanoverian archives. Those dear to her save her mother, who visited her at regular intervals, she never saw again. After four years of captivity, on the occasion of the death of Ernest Augustus, she wrote this heart-rending appeal to her former husband:<sup>1</sup>

I shall never forgive myself for the displeasure I have caused your electoral Highness; I conjure you to accord me pardon for my past faults—I ask it once more, here on my knees and from my very heart. The regret I feel is poignant and bitter beyond power of expression. The sincerity of my repentance ought to gain for me this boon from your Electoral Highness, and if, as the supreme favor of all, you would allow me to see you and embrace our dear children my gratitude for the granting of such favors would be infinite. Nothing do I desire more ardently; could I but have this satisfaction I should be able to die in peace.

To the Electress Sophia she wrote on the same day imploring her intercession and begging to be allowed to kiss her hands. A third letter in like strain is also extant, written eighteen years later, at the time of George's accession to the throne of England; but no notice was ever taken, so far as we know, of any of these communi-

<sup>1</sup> Beaucaire, p. 170.



cations. On the contrary, the young George II. was severely reprimanded for having had the portrait of his mother in his room. More than once voices were heard from the English people demanding news of their rightful queen, but no explanation was ever given. When Sophia Dorothea died at Ahlden in 1726, the king permitted no honors whatever to be shown to her body although the citizens of Hanover were anxious to hold a memorial service. No name was placed on her coffin-plate, none among the living wore the least token of mourning for her. "Why did she not die fifty years earlier?" wrote the Duchess of Orleans to her half-sister; "it would have prevented many misfortunes."

ERNEST F. HENDERSON.

## THE EARLY POLITICAL USES OF THE WORD CONVENTION<sup>1</sup>

IN the dialect of American politics the word convention is applied to gatherings of several different sorts. Occasionally, perhaps, it is used of primary assemblages or political mass meetings, though it may be that in such cases there is always present the notion of persons brought together from distant places, so that a selective principle is at work, even if it is only that inherent in the expense of railroad fares. But usually, it is certain, the word now conveys the concept of a body which is in some formal sense representative, an assemblage of delegates. Of such conventions, two types are most familiar. One is the constitutional convention, in which the representatives of the people are gathered for the purpose of framing an organic or fundamental law; allied to this were those Southern conventions which assumed to represent in a peculiar sense the sovereign peoples of their states and to declare their nullification of federal statutes or their secession from the federal Union. The other familiar type is that of those innumerable nominating conventions by which party organizations put forward their candidates for elective office. The instance of the Hartford Convention shows that there have been other species of the genus in modern times, but they have been less frequent than the two just mentioned. Of the two, it is well known that the latter, the nominating convention, seems to occur for the first time in 1788, and is found only in sporadic cases before the war of 1812. The history of the representative constitutional convention in America begins, apparently, with the early days of the Revolution, when provincial congresses or conventions framed new constitutions for the new states. But there were conventions before there was any making of constitutions, and few conventions of those years confined themselves to that function. An earlier American type than the constitutional convention, then, was that of the revolutionary convention, a body representative of the people and exercising powers of government, but of revolutionary origin.<sup>2</sup> There were not a few instances of county conventions, but the most important variety is the revolutionary convention of the colony or state.

<sup>1</sup> This paper was read before the American Antiquarian Society on October 27, 1897.

<sup>2</sup> The French Convention, called into existence by the law of August 10, 1792, was of this type, and doubtless derived its name from American examples.

It is not necessary to argue elaborately as to the sense in which the word convention was used when applied to these famous gatherings. It is well known that they usually consisted of, or closely resembled, a colonial legislature minus the governor and council, and not summoned by the governor, and that they were called conventions because, of all words denoting a political assemblage, convention was held to be the fit and technical term by which to designate such bodies as these. Precisely such an understanding of the term appears, not only in the case of the conventions of 1774, but in that of the Massachusetts convention of September, 1768. Such, also, was the convention of Massachusetts which Otis proposed in December, 1765. But the idea that this was distinctly the meaning of the word convention mounts farther back into the colonial times. Substantially this idea appears in the action of the lower house of the assembly of South Carolina in 1719. They declared that the writs whereby they had been elected were illegal, because signed by a council whose composition was illegal, as being different from that provided by the proprietary charter; and they therefore resolved "That we cannot Act as an Assembly, but as a Convention, delegated by the People, . . . until His Majesty's Pleasure be known."<sup>1</sup> It was the council and not the governor that was defective, but the thought that a defect in one estate and a consequent illegality in the summons of the lower house made the latter a convention, if it must act at all, is apparent. The same thought is evinced by the Massachusetts convention of May, 1689, and by the Maryland convention of the same year, for though the latter body does not seem to have called itself a convention, there is evidence that it was contemporaneously so called by others.<sup>2</sup> During the course of Bacon's Rebellion in Virginia the rebel chieftain summoned "all the prime Gent:men in these parts to give him a meeting in his quarters" (August 3, 1676).<sup>3</sup> In the declaration which it put forth this body does not call itself a convention,<sup>4</sup> but it is so called in the contemporary narratives of Burwell and Mrs. Cotton and in the later accounts by "T. M." and Beverley.<sup>5</sup>

It is obvious that the instances cited from the years 1689 and 1719, and from later years just preceding the Revolution, were based on the precedent of the English Revolution of 1688, in which the leading part, in representing the nation, was taken by a body

<sup>1</sup> *A Narrative of the Proceedings of the People of South Carolina*, in Carroll's *Historical Collections*, II. 189.

<sup>2</sup> *Maryland Archives*, VIII., XIII.

<sup>3</sup> Mrs. Cotton, in Force's *Tracts*, I., p. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Beverley, p. 75.

<sup>5</sup> Burwell, p. 16, Mrs. Cotton, p. 5, "T. M.," p. 21, in Force, I.

which was substantially a parliament, but which was not summoned by the king and lacked his presence and concurrence, and which, therefore, called itself a convention until the day when, having declared William and Mary king and queen, it declared itself a parliament. There seems to be no evidence that Nathaniel Bacon's convention was modelled on that of 1660. Bacon had been a student of Gray's Inn in 1664, and he was related to that Nathaniel Bacon, member of all the parliaments of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate, who wrote *An Historical Discovery of the Uniformity of the Government of England*, one of the leading constitutional text-books of the country party. Bacon must therefore have been familiar with English precedents. But, as we have seen, it is not known that he called his meeting a convention, and some of Mrs. Cotton's phrases seem to indicate a mass meeting rather than a body of delegates. Other instances of the use of the word convention in its etymological sense of meeting merely, are those conventions of the Massachusetts ministers which began to be held annually before the close of the seventeenth century,<sup>1</sup> and such conventions of the clergy of Virginia as that of 1719, whose transactions are recorded by Bishop Meade.<sup>2</sup>

But whence came the before-mentioned use of the term into English practice? The word as a technical term is unknown to the older parliamentary law of England. The convention of 1689 sought in vain for precedents anterior to 1660.<sup>3</sup> That before the Civil War the word convention, to the English mind, meant simply

<sup>1</sup> Walker, *History of the Congregational Churches in the United States*, pp. 201, 202.

<sup>2</sup> *Old Churches, Ministers and Families of Virginia*, II. 393.

<sup>3</sup> Lady Mordaunt, in a letter to her husband, March 30, 1660, *Clarendon State Papers*, III. 712, says that a lawyer tells her that though there is probably no English precedent for the summons of Parliament by other means than through the action of the Crown, he supposes one may be found in the special commissions for the calling of a parliament in Ireland. In the debates of the convention of 1689 Serjeant Maynard, a great authority, declared it useless to attempt to found the legality of that convention on precedents. There are evidences, by the way, that some of its contemporaries conceived of that convention as possessing those extraordinary and sovereign powers which in later times have been attributed in America to constitutional conventions and conventions for secession. Thus, in *A Brief Collection of some Memorandums: or, Things humbly Offered to the Consideration of the Members of the Great Convention and of the succeeding Parliament* (1689), we read (p. 7) that although that body consists of the same lords and the same commons that usually make up a parliament, "yet being the Representative of the whole Kingdom gathered together in an extraordinary case and manner, and for extraordinary ends, it seemeth to be something greater, and of greater power, than a Parliament. If the whole Nation, thus assembled, shall deliberate about and settle a *New Government* (as if they were to begin the World again) this seemeth to be a Transcendent, Extraordinary and Original power, beyond what they could exert, as a Parliament;" and again (p. 13), "If this *Convention* can do anything, cannot it make laws truly *Fundamental*, and which shall have the same Firmitude and continuance as the Government it sets up?" The view that such conventions can change the terms of the national political contract is also expressed in *A Discourse concerning the Nature, Power and Proper Effect of the Present Conventions in Both Kingdoms* (1689). I have seen no earlier traces of this thought; but see p. 484, *post*, as to Vane.

meeting, even when the word was used of Parliament, may be seen by comparing the phrases in which two authoritative writers of that earlier time express a certain doctrine respecting barren sittings of Parliament. It was recognized as good law that if the representatives of the people came together and separated without the royal assent or refusal being given to any bill, there was technically no session.<sup>1</sup> Thus, when James I. dissolved the "Addled Parliament" of 1614, which had completed no statute, he said, in the commission for dissolving it: "Sed pro eo quod nullus regalis assensus, aut responsio, per nos praestita fuit, nullum Parliamentum, nec aliqua sessio Parliamenti, habuit aut tenuit existentiam."<sup>2</sup> Now the status of such parliaments came up before the judges in 1623, in a discussion relative to a statute which had been passed by the Parliament of 1593, to be in force till the end of the next *session* of Parliament. The judges declared: "If a Parliament be assembled, and divers Orders made, and a Writ of Error brought, and the Record delivered to the higher house, and divers Bills agreed, but no Bills signed: That it is but a Convention, and no Parliament, or Session."<sup>3</sup> Now when Sir Symonds D'Ewes, the contemporary of these judges, has occasion to take notice of a similar case, a brief sitting of the sixth parliament of Elizabeth, in 1586, he says that, since no bill passed, "it could not be a Session but a meer meeting."<sup>4</sup> It is evident from these two passages that by convention the judges meant simply meeting.<sup>5</sup> Nor have I found any instance in which Englishmen before the outbreak of the Civil War used the word in a more technical sense.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hatsell, *Precedents*, I. 133 n., II. 284.

<sup>2</sup> *Old Parl. Hist.*, V. 303.

<sup>3</sup> Hutton's *Reports* (1656), p. 61. In their subsequent discussions, *id.*, p. 62, doubt was cast on this view; but this does not concern the present argument.

<sup>4</sup> *Journals*, p. 383.

<sup>5</sup> So likewise in a passage to which Professor Edward Channing has kindly called my attention, on p. 10 of *Proceedings and Debates of the House of Commons in 1620 and 1621* (Oxford, 1766), where allusion is made to "the last Convention of Parliament," "the last Meeting or Convention of Parliament (which was no Parliament, for that divers Members of that House, after the said Convention, were punished and sent to the Tower for freely speaking their conscience there . . . )."

<sup>6</sup> Mr. Charles H. Firth, of Oxford, has kindly called to my notice a passage in Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion* (Book II., § 95), in which, speaking of the Great Council called by Charles at York, in 1640, in order to avoid calling a Parliament, Clarendon says: "A new Convention, not before heard of, that is, so old that it had not been practised in some hundreds of years, was thought of, to call a Great Council of all the Peers of England." For "Convention" I find "Invention" in the original edition of 1702, I. 116, in that of 1717, I. 147, and in the Dublin edition of 1719, I. 84, and really this seems to my mind to make better sense. But the Oxford-Boston reprint of 1827, I. 240, has "Convention," and so has Mr. Macray's edition of 1888, I. 193, and these I understand present texts more authoritative than those of the early editions. The word can hardly be thought to have here a more definite meaning than that of "meeting." This portion of the book was, I suppose, written in the spring of 1646.

In the second place, though the representatives of the nation in 1689 applied the name convention to themselves, this was not true of the body which in 1660 restored Charles II. That body was elected in accordance with writs issued, by order of the Rump Parliament, in the name of the "Keepers of the Liberties of the Commonwealth of England." It, of course, lacked the authorization of the king. But the only way in which it recognized the public question thence arising was to pass an act, before the king's return, affirming its legality as unquestionable. From the first page of its journals, that is, for a month before the actual arrival of the king, it uniformly gives to itself the title of a parliament.<sup>1</sup> The application of the term convention to it was a matter of popular usage outside its walls. Bishop Burnet<sup>2</sup> speaks of it as "the new parliament, or convention, as it afterwards came to be called, because it was not summoned by the king's writ," implying that the less honorable term was not applied contemporaneously. But the fact is otherwise. A pamphlet of the year 1660, entitled *The Valley of Baca*, raises the question "Whether anything done by this convention can be obliging to the nation, seeing they have not the right constitution of a parliament, according to the fundamental laws of the Kingdom?" A reply to this, entitled *A Scandalous Pamphlet Answered*, speaks of the body as "the parliament, whom he maliciously calleth a convention."<sup>3</sup> Similarly, the author of a tract of the same year called *The Long Parliament is not revived by Thomas Phillips*, says of a portion of Phillips's arguments, "The rest is an answer to Mr. Pryn, and against the authority of this convention, which His Majesty has owned a Parliament."<sup>4</sup> These phrases, and especially those of the first royalist writer, evidently imply that a convention is understood to be a body lacking something of the complete legal forms necessary to constitute it a parliament.<sup>5</sup> Gumble, General Monk's chaplain, whose life of his patron was published in 1671, calls this legislature of 1660 a "Parliament or Convention,"<sup>6</sup> though he has called its pre-

<sup>1</sup>*Common Journals*, 1660, *passim*.

<sup>2</sup>*History of my Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 160.

<sup>3</sup>*Somers Tracts*, ed. Scott, VII. 399, 400, 401.

<sup>4</sup>*Somers Tracts*, ed. Scott, VII. 486. This writer also, p. 487, uses convention in the sense of assembly or meeting merely.

<sup>5</sup>Apparently this notion underlies the use of the word by the Lord Chief Baron, Sir Orlando Bridgman, presiding at the trial of Major-General Harrison. Harrison had said that what he had done had been done by the authority of the Parliament of England. Bridgman declared it preposterous to give that name to the small portion of the Commons which remained after Pride's Purge; and, speaking for the court, says: "None of us do own that convention, whatsoever it be, to be the Parliament of England." *Trial of the Regicides*, ed. 1713, p. 57.

<sup>6</sup>*Life of Monk*, p. 273.



decessors of the republican period parliaments. Edmund Ludlow, writing somewhat later, speaks of it as "the ensuing Convention, which by the vote of the Secluded Members was to be called a Parliament," and in another passage as "a Convention, calling themselves a Parliament."<sup>1</sup>

But the tendency to use the word convention as a semi-technical term denoting a parliament defective or of imperfect legality may be observed in connection with the parliaments of the preceding seven years, subsequent to the dissolution of the Long Parliament in April, 1653.<sup>2</sup> Of such parliaments there were four: that assembly of nominees vulgarly called Barebone's Parliament, July–December, 1653; the first parliament of the Protectorate, September 1654–January 1655; Oliver Cromwell's second parliament, September 1656–June 1657, January–February 1658; and that of Richard Cromwell, January–April 1659. The summons to the members of the first of these bodies studiously avoids giving it a name.<sup>3</sup> Its journal, at the beginning of its proceedings, calls it "this House." But on the third day it resolved, not without opposition and much suggestion of other names,<sup>4</sup> "That the Title of Parliament shall be given to this Assembly." I do not find that Cromwell, who convened it, ever gave it the name either of parliament or of convention, unless in a speech to the officers, reported in an anonymous letter which has perhaps little authority; he seems to call it either a meeting or an assembly simply.<sup>5</sup> Whitelock and Burton call it "the little parliament," its number being exceptionally small; and so does Hobbes in his *Behemoth*.<sup>6</sup> Edward Phillips, Milton's nephew, in his *Continuation of Sir Richard Baker's Chronicle* (1661) alludes

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs*, ed. Firth, II. 247, 260.

<sup>2</sup> It is possible, indeed, that the word bears such a meaning in a passage, to which Mr. Firth has kindly called my attention, in the Declaration of March, 1644, which the Long Parliament put forth against the anti-parliament called by Charles at Oxford. They say that the king is attempting the overthrow and destruction of this Parliament and making way to the setting up of another at Oxford "in stiling that Convention by the name of 'The Lords and Commons of Parliament assembled at Oxford,' being the same title which is therein given to the Parliament." *Old Parl. Hist.*, XIII. 79; Rushworth, V. 576. But in several other passages of the documents relating to this affair the word is evidently used in the sense of "meeting."

<sup>3</sup> *Commons Journals*, VII. 281.

<sup>4</sup> *Commons Journals*, VII. 282.

<sup>5</sup> Carlyle, *Letters and Speeches*, IV. 35, 51, 52, 245. *Cromwellian Diary of Thomas Burton*, I. 383, "a Parliament or Convention." Mr. Gardiner, the second volume of whose *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate* has appeared since this article was written, points out, II. 238, that in the vote upon assuming the title of parliament the tellers of the minority were both members of the Council of State; from this he thinks we may probably infer "that it was the wish of that body, and perhaps even of Cromwell himself, to mark by a less familiar title the exceptional character of the assembly."

<sup>6</sup> Whitelock's *Memorials*; but when speaking of it contemporaneously he calls it simply "the parliament." Burton, II. 67. Hobbes, *English Works*, ed. 1840, VI. 391.

to it as "this new Parliament (for so for distinction we must call it)."<sup>1</sup> Guibon Goddard in 1654 calls it a convention, and so does Ludlow.<sup>2</sup> Thurloe, writing on May 5, 1657, to Henry Cromwell in Ireland, names it "the little convention (as it is called here)".<sup>3</sup> As in a previous letter he had called it "the little assembly," "the little parliament,"<sup>4</sup> this may be thought to indicate that popular speech had begun, while Henry Cromwell had been absent, to assign to this body the name of convention in a peculiar sense, not unconnected with its irregular origin and composition. This thought is strengthened by a passage in Nathaniel Fiennes's *Monarchy Asserted* (1660) in which he gives the text of a speech delivered in April, 1657, in the course of the discussions respecting the offer of the kingship to Cromwell.<sup>5</sup> After the dissolution of the Long Parliament, he says, "the people might have had new writs sent unto them for the election of their representatives, who might have carried on the publick affairs of the nation by a new parliament; but it seems those times would not bear it, and therefore a convention of select persons were called, unchosen by the people, to whom all power was devolved; . . . [and] that assembly, to give greater authority to their actings, stiled themselves a parliament."

Similar phrases, showing a concurrent popular use of convention in the simple sense of meeting and in the special sense of a defective parliament, may be quoted with respect to the ensuing, or protectoral parliaments, except the first, whose legality seems not to have been disputed save by those who totally denied the validity of the republican government. From the first session of the second protectoral parliament Cromwell excluded a large number of members. It was on this ground that Hazelrig characterized it as a "forced Parliament, because some of us were forced out; an imperfect Parliament, a lame Parliament."<sup>6</sup> And doubtless it was on this ground that the author of a tract called *A Narrative of the Late Parliament (so called)* published in 1657, frequently calls the body "the late convention."<sup>7</sup> Apparently it is in this sense that Edward Phillips says, "The last Convention having adjourned on the 26th of June, met again on the 20th of January following,"<sup>8</sup> for he gives the title of parliament freely to Richard Cromwell's legislature.

<sup>1</sup> P. 638.

<sup>2</sup> Goddard in Burton, I. xxx. Ludlow, ed. Firth, I. 365, 366.

<sup>3</sup> Thurloe, *State Papers*, VI. 261.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 243.

<sup>5</sup> *Somers Tracts*, VI. 384.

<sup>6</sup> February 7, 1659, Burton, III. 101.

<sup>7</sup> *Harleian Miscellany*, III. 466, *e. g.*

<sup>8</sup> *Continuation of Baker* (ed. 1661), p. 649.

Richard's parliament, however, though there were no such exclusions from it, and though in respect to the distribution of seats it reverted to the customs of the ancient constitution, rested, like all his government, on the constitution called the Humble Petition and Advice, which had been framed by the "forced Parliament, imperfect Parliament, lame Parliament" of Oliver. There were those among the republicans, therefore, who denied all legality to that constitution,<sup>1</sup> and some of these are found denying the title of parliament to the legislature summoned by Richard. Such was Ludlow, who calls it "Richard's Convention," and such was Mrs. Hutchinson, who calls it "a convention . . . with a seeming face of authority of parliament."<sup>2</sup> Similarly, the royalist author of *England's Confusion*, speaks of it, with a touch of irony, as "a general convention, or parliament, wisely chosen by influence from court."<sup>3</sup> The royalist view of this parliament is hinted at in a passage in *The Tryal of the Regicides*,<sup>4</sup> in which one of them, Thomas Scott, arguing that what he had said in Richard's parliament was privileged, says: "I have heard the Rule [*i. e.*, the ruling of the court] but do not so well understand it, of that spoken in Richard's Parliament; it will be a nice Thing for me to distinguish between that and another Parliament; but this I think, that Convention of the People ought to have the Privilege of the Parliament as well as any other." In other words, if not completely a parliament, it was a quasi-parliament, a convention. It is worth while to add that during these same years Vane, in *The Healing Question* (1656), gave the name of convention to that representative body, or quasi-parliament, by which he would have had the constitution of republican England framed; and Hobbes, in his *Government and Society*, uses the phrase "convention of estates" to designate a supposed quasi-parliament.<sup>5</sup>

In sum, then, it appears that, on the one hand, before the Civil War in 1642 the word convention bears no special or technical sense in the political speech of Englishmen; and that, on the other hand, from the time of the dissolution of the Long Parliament in 1653 we find very definite traces of the idea that a convention is a parliament with certain defects, or marked by certain irregularities. Whence had this idea, which, as we have seen, was also the original idea of the word as politically used in America, been derived or im-

<sup>1</sup> Slingsby Bethel, *True and Impartial Narrative of the most material Debates and Passages in the late Parliament* (1659), in *Somers Tracts*, VI. 480.

<sup>2</sup> *Life of Col. Hutchinson* (ed. 1806), p. 344.

<sup>3</sup> *Somers Tracts*, VI. 515.

<sup>4</sup> Ed. 1713, p. 104.

<sup>5</sup> *English Works*, ed. 1840, II. 87.

ported? I venture to suggest that it was from Scotland. In the constitution of that kingdom the Convention of Estates had a recognized place as a legal institution, and the phrase had a definite meaning. A convention of estates was a less formal parliament, not requiring the warrant or concurrence of the Crown. Its powers also, though not defined with perfect exactness, were less extensive than those of the parliament; it could levy troops and raise money, but it could not make or repeal laws.<sup>1</sup> Such an institution seems not to appear in the medieval history of the kingdom. The first trace of the word convention which I find in the *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland* is under date of June 27, 1545, at Stirling: "Fforsaimekle as It Is thought expedient be the quenis grace my lord gouernor and lordes of counsell convenit in this present conventioun," etc.<sup>2</sup> In this body, and in another assembled in 1561,<sup>3</sup> there was no representation of the third estate. But a convention embracing all three estates was assembled in 1566. Needing that year to raise twelve thousand pounds for the festivities connected with the baptism of their infant son James, the King and Queen (Darnley and Mary) gathered together "a gude nowmer of the prelatteis nobilitie and commissionaris of burrois convenit this day to that effect."<sup>4</sup> The first examples of a convention not summoned by a king seem to have been that which in 1571, the regent Lennox having been mortally wounded, came together at Stirling and chose Mar to be regent in his place, and that which, in the next year, on a similar occasion, elected the regent Morton.<sup>5</sup> Eleven conventions are recorded within the next twenty years; the records of the last twenty-three years of James VI. show eighteen conventions to eleven parliaments. It is plain, then, that the Convention of Estates, though not one of the most ancient institutions of the Scottish monarchy, was now at least well established and definitely recognized. The degree of its independence of the king was less certain. As to his presence, Johnston of Warriston says, in a letter to Hepburn of Humbie, April 20, 1641,<sup>6</sup> relating to the recent convention of 1640: "Montrose did dispute against Argyle, Rothes, Balmerino, and myself; because some urged that, as long as we had a King, we could not sit without him; and it was answered, that to do the less was more lawful than to do the greater" (*i. e.*, to depose him). As to the summoning of the convention without having therefor the warrant of

<sup>1</sup> Laing, *History of Scotland*, I. 40. Rushworth, *Historical Collections*, V. 463, 466.

<sup>2</sup> *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, II. 595.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*, II. 606.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*, II. 608.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*, III. 65-70, 77-81.

<sup>6</sup> Napier, *Montrose*, I. 236.

the Crown, we may note what Robert Baillie says of the discussions that went on in the bodies which, in opposition to King Charles, were ruling Scotland on May 9, 1643 :<sup>1</sup> "The nixt question was more hotlie handled, of their power to call the Estates. This Argyle and Warriston made clear by law and sundrie palpable practiques, even since King James's going to England, where the Estates have been called before the King was acquainted . . . So to-morrow . . . verie unanimously they concluded a Convention of Estates at Edinburgh, June 22d." Another passage in Baillie's letters indicates the views entertained as to the powers of a convention. When the body came together on the date appointed, the Duke of Hamilton presented a letter from King Charles intended to restrict their actions, and especially to restrain them from military preparations. "Bot that," says Baillie,<sup>2</sup> "drew on the question of the House's constitution, whether absolutely or with limitation : when absolutelie had carried it, Hamilton came no more to the house."

Such was in 1643 the Scottish Convention of Estates. The points of resemblance between it and the English bodies we have been inspecting are manifest. As to the transference or borrowing of the term convention, it might readily happen that down to the outbreak of the Civil War the knowledge of such an institution as existing in North Britain was not common among Englishmen, nor had there been in England irregular parliaments for which the name might naturally be borrowed. But it was this very convention of 1643 which allied itself with England in the Solemn League and Covenant for the prosecution of the war against the king, and which cemented that union by joining in the institution of the Committee of Both Kingdoms. Those events must have made the essential features of the constitution of the Scottish conventions widely familiar to English politicians of the Parliamentary party. If the term convention, in the sense under which it has chiefly been discussed in this paper, came into the political vocabulary of Englishmen about this time, it is therefore not unlikely that it came from the northern kingdom.

It may be well to add that, immediately after the Restoration, the Scottish parliament of 1661 passed acts declaring that the power to call parliaments and conventions resided solely in the king, rescinding all acts made in a manner inconsistent with this prerogative, and declaring the convention of 1643 to have been unlawful.<sup>3</sup> Conventions thus restricted were held in 1665, 1667 and

<sup>1</sup> *Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie*, II. 68.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*, II. 77.

<sup>3</sup> *Acts Parl. Scot.*, VII. 10, 16.

1678. The last Scottish convention was that of 1689, which accomplished for Scotland the same revolution that was carried out by the English convention of 1689, and which is perhaps most familiarly kept in mind by the opening lines of the spirited song which Scott wrote to the air of "The Bonnets of Bonnie Dundee:"

"To the Lords of Convention 'twas Claver'se who spoke."

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON.



## DOCUMENTS

### 1. *A Letter of Jefferson on the Political Parties, 1798.*

TO THE EDITOR :

THE following letter, by Thomas Jefferson, now for the first time published, was written seven weeks after President Adams proclaimed the adoption of the Eleventh Amendment and about three months before the passage of the Alien and Sedition Laws. Jefferson was at this time busily organizing the Democratic-Republican Party, as hinted in the reference in the letter to the conversations he held with his friends at Francis's Union Hotel—a noted public house, located at No. 13 South Fourth Street, Philadelphia. It was known as the Indian Queen before the Revolution. It was the scene of many famous dinners, and from its steps Washington bowed his farewell to the people, when, after Adams's inauguration, he accompanied the President, followed by a great throng, and left him at this hotel, where he was to lodge.

The letter contains one of the earliest descriptions of American political parties—at least by Jefferson—that has yet come to light. It suggests why Virginia was selected as the field for the operations of the new party, and contains probably the first draft of the now famous sentence in Jefferson's first inaugural, "We are all Republicans ; we are all Federalists." The MS. belongs to Maj. Wm. H. Loyd, of Ardmore, Pennsylvania, who kindly put it into my hands some years ago, and with his consent I make it public.

FRANCIS N. THORPE.

PHILADELPHIA February 12. 1798.

*Sir*

I have duly received yours of the 28th Ult<sup>o</sup> mentioning that it had been communicated to you, that in a conversation in Francis's Hotel (where I lodge) I had spoken of you as of Tory politics ; and you make inquiry as to the fact and the "idea to be conveyed." I shall answer you with frankness. It is now well understood that two political Sects have arisen within the U. S. the one believing that the executive is the branch of our government which the most needs support ; the other that like the analogous branch in the English Government, it is already too strong for the republican parts of the constitution ; and therefore in equivocal cases they incline to the legislative powers: the former of these are called federalists, sometimes aristocrats or monocrats, and sometimes tories, after the corresponding sect in the English Government of exactly the same definition : the latter are stiled republicans, whigs, jacobins, anarchists, disorganizers &C. these terms are in familiar use with most persons, and which of those of the first class, I used on the occasion alluded to, I do

( 488 )

not particularly remember ; they are all well understood to designate persons who are for strengthening the executive rather than the legislative branches of the Government ; but probably I used the last of those terms, and for these reasons : both parties claim to be federalists and republicans, and I believe with truth as to the great mass of them ; these appellations therefore designate neither exclusively, and all the others are slanders, except those of whig and tory which alone characterise the distinguishing principles of the two Sects as I have before explained them ; as they have been known and named in England for more than a century and as they are growing into daily use here with those, whose respect for the right of private Judgment in others, as well as themselves, does not permit them to use the other terms which either imply against themselves or charge others injuriously.

I remark with real Sensibility the Sentiments of esteem you are pleased to express for my character, and do not suffer myself to believe they will be lessened by any difference which may happen to exist in our political opinions, if any there be : the most upright and conscientious characters are on both Sides of the question : and as to myself, I can say with truth, that political tenets have never taken away my esteem for a moral and good man : on this head I have never uttered a word nor entertained a thought to your prejudice : and even as to politics I could say nothing of my own knowledge as you must be sensible ; but only from the Information of others, having understood on different occasions, that on public questions you have generally concurred with those who were on the Side of executive powers : if in this I have been misinformed, I shall with pleasure correct the error, if otherwise, your conviction of the Solidity of your opinions, will render it satisfactory to you that they have not been mistaken : this is the Sentiment which each side entertains of its own opinions and neither thinks them the Subject of Imputation. I am really sorry that any one should have found gratification in paining you or myself by such a communication ; the circumstance took place in a familiar conversation with gentlemen, who with myself mess together every day at our lodgings, and was therefore the less guarded ; and I do not recollect that there was a person present but of our ordinary Society ; the occasion too was as clear of exception, being used in proof how little of party Spirit there is in Virginia, and how little it influences public proceedings there, and so transient withal, that I dare say it has not been since thought of nor repeated, to any other person than yourself, with what view is not for me to consider.

I have thought I owed to your private and public character this candid declaration, and I have no fear you will mistake the motives which lead to it.

I have the honor to be with great Respect

Sir

your most obedient Servant

The Honbl<sup>e</sup> Mr Wise<sup>1</sup>

TH : JEFFERSON.

<sup>1</sup>This was probably John Wise, of Virginia.

2. *Documents on the Relations of France to Louisiana, 1792-1795.*

THE following documents, copied from the Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Paris, for the Historical Manuscripts Commission of the American Historical Association, elucidate the attempts of Genet upon Louisiana in the years 1793, 1794. In the first report of that Commission (*Report of American Historical Association for 1896*) were printed Genet's complete instructions and a collection of documents chiefly from the French archives and from the George Rogers Clark MSS., of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, showing that a main object of Genet's mission was to conquer Louisiana, the Floridas and Canada, with the aid of Americans friendly to France. To the references in that report may be added the following:

C. DeWitt, *Thomas Jefferson, Étude Historique sur la Démocratie Américaine*, Paris, 1861. (The appendix prints a number of documents from the Archives des Affaires Étrangères, bearing on the project.)<sup>1</sup>

Aulard, *Recueil des Actes du Comité de Salut Public*, I. 361, 393, 478.

Journal of André Michaux, in *Proceedings of American Philosophical Society*, 1889. (The references to his part in the project are brief and scattered, but are important as giving his itinerary and his meetings with George Rogers Clark, Shelby, Jefferson, and others.)

Documents illustrating the Canadian side of the French project are found in the Canadian Archives, particularly in Brymner's *Reports* for 1891 and 1894.

The attempt against Louisiana and the Floridas from the side of South Carolina and Georgia was led by Samuel Hammond and William Tate, under the immediate observation of Mangourit, the consul at Charleston. In this expedition Elijah Clarke, of Georgia, also had part. One of the divisions was to descend the Tennessee and to co-operate in the attack on New Orleans. The Historical

<sup>1</sup> Aside from the documents printed in the *Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission* for 1896, DeWitt prints the following documents (pp. 515-559): "Extrait des Registres des Délibérations du Conseil Exécutif Provisoire," January 17, 1793; letters to Genet from the minister of foreign affairs (Lebrun), February 24, March 10, 1793, (Deforgues) July 30, 1793; letters of Genet to the minister, April 16, May 18, May 31, June 19, July 31, August 15, September 19, October 7 (13A and 13B), and December 10, 1793; an "Arrêté du Comité de Salut Public," October 16; a letter of Samuel Adams to Genet, October 22; and an extract from the "Rapport fait à la Convention Nationale au nom du Comité de Salut Public par le Citoyen Robespierre," November 17, 1793.

Manuscripts Commission will print in its next *Report* the Mangourit Correspondence from the Archives des Affaires Étrangères.

FREDERICK J. TURNER.

I. IMLAY, MEMOIR ON LOUISIANA.

(Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Louisiane et Florides, 1792 à 1803, Vol. 7, doct. 1.)

Memoire sur la Louisiane, présenté au Comité de Salut public par un Citoyen Américain<sup>1</sup>

Le Capitaine Imlay<sup>2</sup>, persuadé que votre attention est sans cesse entraînée sur une multitude d'objets, par les évènements qui se pressent les uns sur les autres, en ce moment critique de votre glorieuse révolution, n'ose presque espérer que vous voudrez bien vous occuper quelques instans de plans politiques qui n'ont pas une relation immédiate avec le Salut de votre liberté

Mais les avantages sans nombre que présente à la France l'exécution d'un projet sur la Louisiane, le peu d'attention qu'il faut pour les apercevoir, La Facilité de les obtenir, tout le porte à croire qu'en venant vous offrir quelques éclaircissemens Sur cet objet, il ne s'expose ni à paraître importun, ni à essuyer un refus. Il craint d'ailleurs que les papiers présentés sur ce sujet à votre Comité par le Ministre le Brun n'ayent pas encore pu être examinés dans un tems où vos travaux continuels suffisent à peine pour tout ce qu'exige de vous le Salut public

La Louisiane est regardée par l'Espagne comme la pierre angulaire qui soutient ses mines brillantes, ces réservoirs sans Fond de sa richesse imaginaire ; et lorsque les établissemens du Nord de l'Amérique se sont rapidement étendus jusque sur les bords Fertiles du Mississipi, elle a tremblé qu'ils ne lui fussent enlevés. Il y a Sept ans que le Ministre d'Espagne résidant auprès des Etats Unis, mit en œuvre tous les ressorts de sa politique pour sapper ces établissemens, et les empêcher de s'élever à un degré imposant de Force et de puissance

Ce Ministre sentait bien qu'en terminant la contestation élevée par les Citoyens des Etats unis Sur la liberté de descendre le Mississipi pour entrer dans l'Océan, il arrêterait ces établissemens. Il fit des représentations réitérées à la Cour de Madrid sur le danger de les laisser approcher des possessions Espagnoles, il obtint enfin qu'il serait autorisé à proposer aux Etats Atlantiques de grands avantages pour leur commerce dans les ports d'Espagne, et dans ceux de ses isles : mais à condition que les Etats Unis consentiraient à abandonner leurs prétentions au Droit de naviguer sur le Fleuve du Mississipi

Ces projets ayant avorté, l'Espagne n'en a pas moins continué à

<sup>1</sup> Endorsed : "1792 C<sup>a</sup> Otto." Compare *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, (Hist. MSS. Comm.), p. 953.

<sup>2</sup> See Gilbert Imlay, *Topographical Description of the Western Territory of America* ; Paul, *Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft to Gilbert Imlay* ; Appleton's *Cyclopaedia of American Biography*.

amuser les Américains, en leur Faisant des propositions aussi méprisables at aussi dérisoires que Son despotisme est oppressif. Mais les habitans de la partie occidentale des Montagnes Appalaches ont les yeux constamment tournés vers le moment Favorable où ils s'empareraient de la nouvelle Orléans de manière à pouvoir en conserver la possession. Cette conquête est certaine dès qu'ils voudront l'entreprendre ; elle Serait même Fort aisée. Mais vouloir conquérir la Louisiane lorsqu'il Serait très Facile à l'Espagne de Fermer l'embouchure du Mississipi, tant qu'ils n'auraient point de vaisseaux pour la garder, ce serait aussi ridicule que le Sont les efforts chevaleresques des despotes de l'Europe pour rétablir l'ancienne tyrannie de la France.

Telle a été la rapidité des progrès de ces établissemens qu'un nouvel Etat s'est Formé sur les bords de l'Ohio depuis 1780 et qu'un désert inhabité s'est changé tout-à-coup en une contrée couverte d'une population si nombreuse qu'elle a demandé et obtenu d'être admise dans la confédération des Etats Unis. d'autres établissemens Se Forment encore de chaque coté, vers l'embouchure de la riviere, et tous avec la même rapidité, dans une etendue de 400 lieues de France en y comprenant les sinuosités de la Rivière, et non moins de 250 Lieues en droite ligne.

Le Capitaine Imlay est persuadé que, Sans y comprendre ceux qui se sont établis sur l'etendue du territoire Espagnole le nombre des Blancs vivant sur les bords du Mississipi se porte au moins à 400,000 ames. Sur ce nombre, il se trouve peut-être plus de *quarante mille hommes* en état de porter les armes : la plupart d'entre'eux, engagés pendant plus de douze ans dans des combats contre les nations Sauvages ; sont aussi habiles à les manier que les vétérans les plus expérimentés. Ce sont des hommes brulans du Feu de la liberté, et vivement aigris contre l'Espagne qui ne cesse de violer leurs privilèges, d'apporter des entraves au cours naturel de leur prospérité, et de paralyser pour eux la main active de l'industrie et de l'émulation.

C'est d'après une connaissance acquise par une ancienne et longue résidence parmi ce peuple justement indigné, que le Capitaine Imlay ose affirmer que ce même peuple a trop le sentiment de sa dignité pour laisser échapper l'occasion de se faire lui-même justice. independamment des Forces qui pourraient venir des établissemens des Etats unis dans les contrées occidentales, on aurait bientôt levé dans la Louisiane une petite armée qui serait assez Forte pour renverser dans cette partie le Gouvernement Espagnol.

De la nouvelle Orleans aux Natchés, il y a un établissement de plus de 50,000 ames, dont la totalité est composée de Français et d'Américains. Ils ont Si longtems gémi sous la tyrannie de cet horrible gouvernement qu'ils se leveraient en masse, et arboreraient l'étendart de l'indépendance à la moindre lueur de liberté. Les forces Espagnoles ne se montent pas à plus de 1500 hommes de troupes, qui ont à garder la rivière depuis la nouvelle Orléans jusqu'à St. Louis, à l'embouchure du Missouri, une étendue de pays, au moins de 600 lieues de France : et un grand nombre d'entr'eux Sont Français.

L'Egoïsme, ce malheureux principe qui influence trop souvent la conduite politique des Etats unis, les porterait sans doute à étouffer promptement tout projet qui tendrait à miner la puissance Espagnole en Amérique dans la crainte de se trouver enveloppés dans une querelle avec l'Espagne, et de perdre les avantages commerciaux dont jouissent les pays sur les bords de la mer qui constituent la majorité des Etats, et que leur procure leur neutralité actuelle à l'égard des puissances belligérantes. d'après ces considérations, il serait nécessaire de conduire cette affaire avec beaucoup de circonspection, et la plus grande habileté.

Mais si la dignité de la liberté a été blessée, si l'honneur commande à des hommes libres d'effacer cet opprobre, il serait aussi honteux que lâche aux habitans de la partie occidentale, de suivre les principes d'une politique aussi étroite et aussi peu généreuse, et d'abandonner où d'arrêter une entreprise qui doit elever cet empire naissant à un si haut degré de splendeur.

L'Espagne connaissant tout l'odieux attaché aux Formes tyranniques de son gouvernement, non seulement sentirait tous Ses nerfs trembler dans son corps paralysé, mais encore selon toute apparence, Ferait tous Ses efforts pour soutenir la grandeur imaginaire de son empire d'Amérique, et vuiderait plus vite ses coffres. par-là la France aurait toute sorte d'avantages lorsqu'il s'agirait de négocier la paix

La proximité de la Louisiane et des Antilles aurait dans peu de tems Fait de la nouvelle Orléans l'entrepot naturel d'où ces îles tireraient la plus grande partie des objets que ne leur Fournit pas le sol des pays situés entre les tropiques. Et la France, lorsque son commerce viendrait à se régénérer, pourrait tirer de grands avantages des productions de cette contrée Fertile. Les établissemens vers le haut de L'Ohio qui embrassent Kentucky et le Cumberland, produiraient peut être en moins de cinq ans plus de tabac que n'en produisent ensemble la Virginie et le Maryland, dès qu'une Fois la navigation du Mississipi serait ouverte. En effet le sol de ces établissemens est, non seulement plus neuf, mais encore plus gras. Celui de l'ancien pays est entièrement épuisé par la culture Funeste de cette plante. Ces contrées pourraient même en produire plus qu'il n'en Faut pour la consommation du globe, et à un prix plus bas qu'on ne le vend actuellement ; par conséquent le commerce de cette denrée passerait en entier dans la nouvelle Orléans.

Jusqu'à quel degré les intérêts politique de la France exigent-ils qu'elle conserve la Nouvelle Orléans, tandis que le Sucre, le café et le Coton Forment des articles importans de son economie domestique, et qu'elle ne peut les tirer que des indes occidentales? Jusqu'à quel point le commerce de la Louisiane établi sur des principes généreux, ce premier mobile de la prospérité, contribuera-t-il à Faire Fleurir de nouveau le commerces des indes occidentales? ce sont là des considérations sur lesquelles le Capitaine Imlay ne veut point s'appesentir. Il ne veut que les soumettre à la sagesse de votre Comité, persuadé d'ailleurs que les habitans de la partie occidentale de l'Amérique seraient au comble de leurs vœux, s'ils avaient une communication libre et directe avec la mer ;



parcequ'ils n'ont aucune possession maritime, ni l'ambition d'en acquérir.

d'après ces considérations, indépendamment du dommage que pourraient causer aux navires de vos ennemis qui s'en retournent chez eux, et qui passent le long des isles sous le vent, les Corsaires sortant de la nouvelle Orléans, Le Capitaine Imlay a pensé que cette diversion pourrait seconder les nobles efforts que vous Faites pour consolider la liberté et l'Egalité, et vous procurer des moyens qui seraient dans la suite très avantageux à votre commerce.

Si votre Comité voit évidemment l'importance de ce plan, Le Capitaine Imlay se persuade que la Faible dépense qu'il nécessiterait, laquelle n'excéderait pas *sept cent cinquante mille livres*, comme on le verra par l'état joint aux projets présentés à votre Comité par le Ministre le Brun, ne sera point une raison pour l'abandonner: il n'apportera d'ailleurs aucun retard aux autres plans de votre gouvernement. avec cette Somme on obtiendrait un succès infaillible.

Mais si votre Comité regarde la dépense qu'exige l'exécution de ce plan, comme trop considérable; ou si dans le moment de crise où se trouve la république, il n'a pas le tems d'examiner, et de peser les conséquences de cette expedition, Le Capitaine Imlay ose croire que rien ne s'oppose à ce qu'on charge le Ministre des affaires Etrangères de donner une Commission en blanc avec des instructions sur cet objet, au Ministre Genet, résidant a philadelphie, afin qu'il suive ce projet; ou qu'on laisse la chose entièrement à sa discretion, car il serait très possible de trouver des hommes dans les établissemens de la partie occidentale, qui entreprendraient cette expédition à leurs propres risques et dépens, s'ils étaient assurés que les colons et la République Française leur donneront des Secours.

## II. COMMITTEE FOR THE EXPEDITION AGAINST LOUISIANA.

(Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Espagne, Vol. 635, doct. 313.)

### Comité

à former pour l'expedition de la louisiane et celle des autres établissemens espagnols<sup>1</sup>

Ce Comité doit exister en Amérique et n'agir que sous la direction du ministre de france près des états unis.

son objet doit être

- 1<sup>o</sup> de s'occuper des moyens d'enlever à l'Espagne la nouvelle orleans et toute la Louisiane.
- 2<sup>o</sup> de rechercher les moyens de faire soulever toutes les Colonies espagnoles soit dans le continent soit dans Les îles.
- 3<sup>o</sup> de faire passer dans nos Colonies, les denrées comme bleds et salaisons

<sup>1</sup> Endorsed: "Mars 1793."

de territoire de L'ouest d'amérique, qui sont des deux tiers moins chers que pris dans les Etats unis.

On peut admettre dans ce Comité

1<sup>o</sup> Joel Barlow,<sup>1</sup> Americain depuis naturalisé citoyen français. C'est un véritable ami de la liberté, philosophe, pur dans ses mœurs. ce qui mérite toute espece de confiance, il a bien servi et la revolution américaine et la révolution française, on pourrait lui confier la direction generale sous Genet et le maniemment des fonds.

2<sup>o</sup> Sayre<sup>2</sup> né en Amérique, sheriff a Londres, depuis établi en france, il a une grande activité beaucoup de fertilité dans la tête pour les expédiens ; il connaît l' Amérique et saura tirer parti des dispositions des habitans contre l' Espagne. Sayre sera tres utile, pourvu qu'il soit bien surveillé.

3<sup>o</sup> Beaupoil—c'est un officier français qui a servi de bonne heure entre autres dans la Confédération polonaise de 1771.—il a du courage, une fort résolution, il connaît le pays et sera excellent pour l'attaque

4<sup>o</sup> Lyonnet—français qui a passé quelques années à la nouvelle orléans, connaît les localités, il parait d'une humeur paisible mais il servira par ses lumieres locales.

On pourrait envoyer ces quatre personnes à Philadelphie avec une mission secrete et différens brevets, ils formiraient les commencemens du Comité que je propose.

On donnerait des appointemens à ces quatre individus proportionnés à l'emploi qu'ils auraient dans cette entreprise

Avant leur départ ils concerteront leur plan avec le citoyen Otto qui connaît bien les ressources qu'on peut trouver dans les Etats unis pour faire réussir cette expédition.

Il ne faudrait pas perdre un moment pour arrêter le plan.

Il y a maintenant différens navires prêts à retourner en Amérique, il serait à propos que ces quatre individus partissent par des batimens séparés.

En partant Sous un mois, ils arriveront en Amérique dans le cours de Juillet, et n'auront pas trop de tems pour achever cette année l'affaire de la Louisiane ; à moins que Genet ne la prépare.

Si Genest n'a pas de brevets d'officiers, il faudrait lui en envoyer, ainsi qu'une autorisation générale, pour préparer le soulèvement des Colonies espagnoles.

Il faudra aussi l'autoriser à appliquer à cette enterprise une partie des sommes dues par les états unis, à la france.

On pourrait acheter du Congrès pour le Compte simulé de nos colonies 8 à 10,000 fusils.

Peut être faudra-t-il envoyer d'ici de la poudre et des balles.

<sup>1</sup>Todd, *Life and Letters of Joel Barlow*, New York, 1886. See also *Report American Historical Association*, 1896, p. 945, note 3, p. 954. Winsor, *Westward Movement*, 311, discusses the relations of Barlow to Brissot, in reference to the Scioto speculations.

<sup>2</sup>See Appleton's *Cyclopaedia of American Biography*. On December 27, 1793, Stephen Sayre presented to Congress a claim for service under Arthur Lee and Franklin, during the Revolution.

Ces quatre personnes désignées prépareraient le soulèvement des Colonies espagnoles que pourrait achever Miranda.

Il est probable que le Mexicain qui a écrit au Citoyen Claviere pour cette expédition, sera assuré avant le départ des quatre citoyens et alors il faudra l'entendre et concerter tout avec lui.

### III. PIERRE LYONNET'S CONSIDERATIONS ON LOUISIANA.<sup>1</sup>

(Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Espagne, Vol. 635, document 316.)

#### Considerations sur la Louisiane<sup>2</sup>

La Louisiane qui faisait autrefois partie de nos possessions d'outremer, et qui s'étend depuis le vingt neuvième degré de Latitude Septentrionale, jusqu'au quarante cinquième et au delà, se trouve divisée aujourd'hui entre les Espagnols et les Américains. Il s'en faut de beaucoup que le partage des derniers soit aussi avantageux que celui des premiers qui ont usurpé sur eux et la navigation du fleuve, et la possession de ce qu'il y a de meilleur. Sur la rive orientale, quoique le traité de paix de 1783 leur donnât des droits incontestables à ces deux grands objets. Ce n'est pas que les Colons répandus sur la belle rivière autrement dite *l'Ohio*, n'aient été très sensibles à cet outrage, et qu'ils n'aient même porté leurs plaintes au Congrès; mais soit que Le Sénat Américain ait cherché à ménager l'Espagne, ou qu'il ait vu d'un œil jaloux la prospérité des nouveaux Etats; il est certain qu'il a fermé l'oreille à leurs cris. Cependant les demandes et les menaces se sont renouvelées avec aigreur, et sans la malheureuse guerre avec les Sauvages, les Américains occidentaux auraient déjà forcé l'Espagne à leur rendre justice. Ne dépendants du Congrès que pour la forme; séparés des autres Etats par des bois et des montagnes immenses, ils frémissent de voir leur prospérité suspendue par l'impossibilité des exportations; Ils sentent avec douleur que tout libres qu'ils sont, L'Espagne en leur bouchant le Mississipi, les a rendus esclaves. Ils sentent qu'ils peuvent aprovisionner les Antilles en comestibles de tout genre, et s'aprovisionner eux mêmes des Eaux de vie de France, ainsi que de plusieurs autres articles. Avec quels transports ne recevraient-ils pas des amis qui en les aidant à conquérir la navigation du Mississipi, se chargeraient en même tems de tout L'odieux que la Cour de Madrid trouverait dans une attaque contre la Louisiane. Je dirai plus; Le Congrès approuverait tacitement une entreprise de cette nature par des français, s'il est vrai de dire qu'elle lui épargnerait des explications, et peut-être une prompte rupture avec le Monarque Castillan.

S'il est vrai et certain qu'une expédition contre la Louisiane serait bien vue des Américains des Pays à L'ouest; il est encore plus vrai qu'elle serait favorisée et soutenue par les créoles français du Mississipi. J'ai tort de dire Créoles français puisqu'il n'y a pas quatre espagnols

<sup>1</sup> Endorsed "Vers Mars 1793."

<sup>2</sup> Compare Nos. 1, 1a, 1b, 2, Clark-Genet documents in *Report of Historical Manuscripts Commission*, 1896, and the letters of Lyonnet, Nos. VI, VII and VIII, *post*. See also États-Unis, Vol. 7, folio 9, for another letter of Lyonnet.

établis hors de la Nouvelle Orléans. trente ans de servitude n'ont pu les détacher de leur mere Patrie, ni éteindre en eux une fierté qui est naturelle aux Américains. La disparité des usages et des mœurs de leurs tirans, leur inspire une haine insurmontable contre tout ce qui est espagnol. Tous ceux qui ont séjourné parmi eux, assureront avec moi qu'ils Sont entièrement dévoués à la france et qu'ils soupirent après le moment qui leur rendra leur première existence. Ils n'ont pas oublié le massacre de leur concitoyens par le féroce Oreilly. Et comment l'auraient-ils oublié, quand le sang de tant de victimes de leur amour à la france, fume encore et demande vengeance. Si le despotisme a pu la refuser, que les enfans de la Liberté l'accordent. La Jeunesse créole aussi martiale que la Jeunesse de france lui est supérieure pour l'adresse dans les exercices du Corps et l'habitude à manier les armes.

Après avoir dit deux mots sur les dispositions des Américains à l'ouest, et surtout des Louisianais, je vais donner une description succincte, mais exacte des postes et des forts que l'on trouve depuis l'embouchure de l'ohio dans le Mississipi jusqu'à la N<sup>le</sup> Orléans capitale du Pays. Comme je ne me suis pas proposé de donner le tableau de La Colonie, mais seulement du cours du fleuve, je ne parlerai point ici de plusieurs postes situés a 40 ou 50 Lieues de ses bords.<sup>1</sup>

Le premier poste que l'on trouve à quinze lieues au dessous du confluent de l'ohio et du mississipi, et devant lequel il faut se présenter, se nomme *Anse à la graisse*.<sup>2</sup> Il est construit en Bois sur un terrain bas et inondé, garni d'une dizaine de petits canons, et commandé par un Espagnol qui a sous lui dixhuit à 20 hommes. Je crois qu'il est facile de l'enlever sans retarder l'expédition de quatre heures. L'artillerie en est bonne et les magazins assez bien fournis. Si l'on jugeait le moindre retard dange-reux, on passerait ce fort pendant la nuit sans craindre la moindre chose, et l'on se hâterait d'arriver au *Nogal*<sup>3</sup> qui est un nouveau fort construit sur une hauteur à deux cent trente lieues de l'anse à la graisse. quelle que soit la position avantageuse de ce fort, à la construction duquel l'Espagne a beaucoup dépensé, il ne m'a pas paru mériter toute l'importance que l'on veut lui donner. 1°. parcequ'il ne peut avoir de communication avec le premier fort, que par le fleuve et qu'il serait très facile de la couper des lors que l'on voudrait faire route nuit et jour. 2°. Parcequ'il est certain que l'on peut se laisser couler tout doucement devant le fort pendant l'obscurité. Cependant il est garni d'une nombreuse artillerie et peut avoir trente à 40 hommes de garnison.

À trente Lieues au dessous du *Nogal*, on voit Le Poste du Natchez dont tous les habitans sont Américains. Leur nombre s'élevait il y a quatre ans à cinq mille ; mais depuis que la Cour de Madrid a refusé de prendre leur tabac, et qu'elle leur a envoyé un gouverneur, Le nombre est au

<sup>1</sup> Compare *Report of Historical MSS. Commission* for 1896, the Clark-Genet documents, Nos. 2, 2b, 4; *American Historical Review*, April, 1897, II. 475 (Carondelet's description of these posts); Collot, *Journey in North America* (1796), with atlas.

<sup>2</sup> New Madrid.

<sup>3</sup> Vicksburg.

moins réduit à moitié. Les uns se sont jetés dans de nouveaux établissemens, Les autres réduits à la misère ont regagné les Etats unis, et ceux qui restent soupirent bien ardemment après des Libérateurs

Le fort qui fut autrefois construit par les français, est si délabré qu'il ne tiendrait pas contre deux pieces de bas calibre. La Garnison est ordinairement composé de 50 hommes. j'observe ici que depuis l'anse à la Graisse jusqu'au Natchez, il n'y a aucun habitant.

Le dernier fort que l'on trouve avant d'arriver à la Nouvelle Orléans est Baton rouge. outre qu'il est peu considérable, on peut le dépasser comme les autres en serrant la terre près du fort. il n'y a pas au dela de 12 hommes. Entre le Natchez et baton rouge est un vaste espace de terrain inhabité qui servirait admirablement à couper toute communication avec la ville. Six hommes suffirait à cela.

Si l'on jugeait nécessaire d'enlever Les forts, j'indiquerais les moyens qui me semblent Les plus propres.

Depuis la *Pointe coupée*, ou le fort de *Baton rouge*, Les deux rives du fleuve sont continuellement couvertes de riches habitations qui s'étendent à 20 lieues au dessous de La Nouvelle Orleans, pendant une espace de quatre vingt lieues. Cette vaste étendue de terrain n'est à proprement parler qu'une langue de terre formée par le fleuve. a 40 arpens de profondeur on trouve des deux cotés, une chaine de marais et de lacs qui rendent toute approche impossible.

La Nouvelle Orléans<sup>1</sup> cette ville que sa position semble destiner à devenir un jour Le plus riche entrepot du monde, n'est pas si éloignée de cet état de splendeur que l'on pense. Les Américains frequentent déjà son port depuis plusieurs années, ou ils amènent des milliers de Boucauds de tabac et d'autres denrées. Elle est bâtie en quarré long sur le bord du fleuve qui l'inonderait pendant les crues, s'il n'était retenue par une forte Levée. Si l'on en excepte une palissade dont vient de l'environner le nouveau Gouverneur, il est certain qu'elle est dénuée de toute fortification, et qu'elle ne tiendrait pas vingt minutes contre un coup de main. La Garnison qui n'a jamais excédé trois cents hommes est principalement composée de francais qui se flattent depuis long tems que le moment de leur délivrance n'est pas loin. Elle est logée dans un Quarter bâti par les français vis a vis du quel est une rangée de canons, mal en ordre, mais presque tous de fort calibre. Au reste tous les bords du fleuve Sont ouverts, et par conséquent favorables à un débarquement.

Je me contenterai donc pour démontrer la nullité des forts en descendant le Mississipi, de dire qu'il est impossible de faire passer des *avisos* d'un fort à l'autre, et qu'un coureur de Bois ne peut jamais faire par terre Le chemin que fait une berge bien montée en rameurs qui marcheraient jour et nuit.

après avoir donné superficiellement la description des bords du fleuve et des forts que l'on y voit, je vais dire quelque chose des moyens con ductifs à cette expédition. Je pense qu'il serait convenable de trans-

<sup>1</sup> See the plan of New Orleans in 1798, in *Report of Tenth Census, Social Statistics of Cities . . . New Orleans*, p. 28.

porter sept à huit cents hommes dans un port de mer de l'Amérique septentrionale qui se rendraient par pelotons Sur l'ohio, comme si leur but étaient d'aller s'y fixer en qualité d'agriculteurs. Ces hommes seraient dévancés par des personnes Sûres qui se rendraient au *fort Pitt* et au Kentucky pour y préparer les embarcations, et y former une association de volontaires. une fois que tout serait prêt, l'on se mettrait en marche. il faudrait surtout commencer l'expédition en Octobre, tems où les Américains ne descendent plus

Aux Berges il faudrait joindre quelques canots légers pour donner chasse aux pirogues, et intercepter tout canot de descente. après avoir dépassé les forts, chose que je juge aisée, pour peu que l'expédition soit bien conduite, il est question de se présenter devant la Nouvelle Orléans pendant la nuit. Le débarquement fait, le gros de la troupe se porterait incontinent au quartier pour s'emparer des Batteries et amener la garnison a recevoir une vive fusillade, un autre peloton se porterait en même tems chez le gouverneur et le Colonel qu'il tiendrait prisonniers jusqu'a ce que tout fut soumis.

Quelque facile que paraisse cette expédition, il est nécessaire d'y apporter toutes les précautions imaginables. il serait donc à propos d'y faire passer deux personnes affidées qui auraient soin d'examiner la situation du lieu, L'état de la garnison, et même de prévenir et de sonder l'esprit des soldats français. Ces deux émissaires qui connaîtraient à peu près le tems de l'expédition se rendraient chez un habitant sur la route, et instruiraient l'armement des moyens de réussite. Dans le cas que par quelques coureurs de Bois le gouvernement serait instruit de quelque chose, on pourrait débarquer sur la rive opposée et forcer en très peu de tems la ville à se rendre. je ne doute aucunement d'après les connaissances que j'ai de la Colonie, que les habitans se joindraient avec ardeur à leurs freres de france.

Enlever cette colonie aux espagnols, c'est leur porter un coup d'autant plus terrible qu'ils auront dès lors à craindre pour leurs possessions du Mexique, et que l'on peut faire sortir des corsaires qui iront faire des prises jusque sous le canon de la *Vera cruz*

De la conquete de cette colonie nait cette Question : quel parti doit on tirer de la Louisiane? je crois qu'il faudrait l'inviter à se réunir à la grande République Américaine en se reservant certains avantages, et en l'assurant d'une protection signalée. Par là la france s'épargnerait bien des dépenses sans rien perdre de Son commerce. L'on sait que les Louisianais sont accoutumés à nos productions et même à nos manufactures, et qu'il leur est impossible de s'en passer. je sens bien que pendant le cours de la guerre les Américains leur porteraient nos denrées de france, et qu'ils nos rapporteraient de l'indigo et du Riz en payement ; mais à la paix nous serions à même d'y faire le commerce par nous même. je dis plus les Américains établis sur la Belle riviere deviendraient aussi consommateurs des importations faites au Mississipi.

j'avais oublié de dire que de la N<sup>le</sup> Orleans à l'embouchure du Mississipi, on comptait environ 30 Lieues et que l'entrée du fleuve est defendue



moins par un triste fort, que par des barres qui varient tres frequemment. Dans la Supposition que l'on préfèrait attaquer par mer je donnerais également Les renseignemens que j'ai pu acquerir par de frequens voyages soit à la floride soit à Pensacole.

Dan le cas encore que la nation ne voudrait pas faire passer du monde de france pour cette expédition ; elle devrait au moins faire passer au Kentucky quelques personnes hardies et entreprenantes qui réussiraient peut etre à decider Les Américains et les francais qui y sont établis à faire la descente Et à ouvrir l'entrée du Mississipi à un petit armement qui partirait de france pour croiser dans les parages.

Telles sont les observations que Six ans de séjour, et de voyage dans tous les postes de La Louisiane ont fourni à un Citoyen qui n'a jamais rien eu de plus à cœur que de servir sa Patrie, et qui brule de lui consacrer et ses services et ses jours.

PIERRE LYONNET.

#### IV. LYONNET'S ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.<sup>1</sup>

(Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Espagne, Vol. 635, document 317.)

J'ai l'honneur de soumettre à votre examen les observations que je crois les plus conductives à accélérer le projet qui vous occupe dans ce moment. Vos Lumières sauront aisément distinguer ce qui sera practicable d'avec ce qui ne saurait l'être, et je ne doute nullement qu'au travers de ce que je vais dire vous ne découvriiez quelques rayons de clarté.

Comme vos réflexions m'ont appris qu'il serait dangereux, et même impolitique de débarquer une quantité de monde sur le territoire d'une Puissance neutre, et qu'il serait d'ailleurs très difficile de réunir plusieurs aventuriers discrets et prudens pour être transportés au delà des mers, je vais uniquement m'attacher à indiquer la conduite des personnes que l'on jugerait convenable d'employer.

Et d'abord je pense qu'il serait superflus de faire passer beaucoup de monde en Amérique, puisque l'armement doit se faire Sur l'Ohio Il suffirait donc d'y envoyer six personnes sûres et toutes six capables de jouer six rôles différens. Arrivée à Philadelphie, elles se concerteraient avec notre ambassadeur et les personnes que l'ambassadeur jugerait convenable d'employer, Sur les moyens les plus prompts et les moins dispendieux. D'après un plan formé avec maturité et réflexion ces six personnes, et celles que le ministre aurait jugé dignes de leur être adjointes, se rendraient d'abord au *fort Pitt*, et delà au Kentucky. Pendant leur séjour à Philadelphie, il serait prudent de paraître dans l'intention d'acheter des Terres pour s'établir dans les Pays à l'ouest, par là sans donner le moindre ombrage, on pourrait faire tous les achats jugés nécessaires.

Il serait surtout important d'emporter de france une quantité de brevets pour différens grades, tous en blanc, mais d'ailleurs Signé et en règle. à ces brevets il faudrait joindre un manifeste pour les Louisianais qui se distribuerait à mesure que l'on descendrait le fleuve.

<sup>1</sup> Endorsed : "Vers Mars 1793."

La démarche la plus essentielle sera d'étudier et de choisir les personnes que l'on doit initier dans le secret Sur les bords de l'Ohio. Le Citoyen Tardiveau frere<sup>1</sup> du défunt cy devant commandant aux Kaskaskias, peut être d'un grand secours pour connaître les hommes utiles.

Comme Le succès dépend en partie du secret, et de ne rien laisser dans le principe à deviner aux Curieux ; les personnes ou chefs qui seraient initiés, et par conséquent brevetés et chargés de trouver des volontaires, les rassembleraient sous le prétexte de faire des courses contre les Sauvages. On trouve au Kentucky, et dans les autres établissemens cinquante chefs tous connus par des actions d'éclat, Soit dans la dernière guerre, soit contre les Sauvages. Il y en a certains si habiles à manier l'esprit des habitans, que dès qu'ils parlent d'une Sortie contre les indiens, la jeunesse se précipite de tous cotés sous leurs drapeaux. à la tête de ces filibustiers des Bois, il faut placer le General . . . <sup>2</sup> qui dans la dernière guerre, enleva entre autres postes, celui de Vincennes. Son nom Seul vaut beaucoup de monde, et il n'est pas un Américain qui n'ait la plus grande confiance en lui. Il y a encore à Philadelphie un nommé *Willing*<sup>3</sup> connu également par plusieurs coups hardis tous faits sur le mississipi contre les Anglais.

Les volontaires des pays à l'ouest prévenus par leurs chefs ne seraient longtems sans être prêts ; mais leur ardeur redoublerait considérablement quand on leur annoncerait qu'il s'agit de s'emparer d'un pays soumis à une puissance qui s'oppose aux succès et à la prospérité du leur. alors il n'y aurait qu'un seul cri pour le départ. on ne manquerait pas de leur faire valoir la liberté de leur commerce assurée pour jamais, la grandeur du Butin, la faiblesse de la défense, et les avantages de rivaliser Les bords atlantiques dans l'approvisionnement des Antilles.

à tous ces avantages il faudrait joindre pour les Américains la libre navigation du mississipi, et même l'espérance de voir la louisiane faire partie de leur République.

Dès que l'on se serait abouché avec les chefs Américains et que l'on verrait la possibilité de la réussite, il serait question de se procurer les embarcations que l'on jugerait les plus nécessaires, et les plus convenables à l'opération. il faudrait qu'elles fussent de bonne marche, et Susceptibles de recevoir le Double au moins de monde de ce qui serait employer à ramer afin que les rameurs pussent se relever de six heures en six heures et ainsi marcher jour et nuit. il est surtout important d'avoir d'excellens guides. s'ils étaient rares chez les Américains, on en trouverait abondamment au poste Vincennes et aux Illinois.

Cependant pour éviter les soupçons que pourraient donner l'équipement des Berges, ou bateaux, il serait à propos de faire avec les chefs de l'entreprise, ou toute autre personne, un grand nombre d'achats simulés

<sup>1</sup> Compare *Report of Historical Manuscripts Commission*, 1896, Clark-Genet correspondence, documents I, 30, 69.

<sup>2</sup> Evidently George Rogers Clark.

<sup>3</sup> See Winsor, *Westward Movement*, index.

de Tabacs et autres denrées de façon qu'il paraîtrait que les Batteaux seraient destinés à les recevoir.

Les provisions de bouche se trouvant à bon compte, il serait facile de se procurer tout ce qui serait nécessaire. Pour dire quelque chose de certain sur les munitions de guerre, il faudrait être à Philadelphie, et avoir des renseignemens très frais Sur le Kentucky. il faudrait savoir si la Poudre que l'on y fabrique est de bonne qualité, et si l'on y trouverait du canon à acheter ainsi que des Pierriers.

Si l'on était sûr d'arriver Sur la N<sup>le</sup> Orleans, sans que la nouvelle de la descente y eut dévancé l'armement, il n'y aurait aucune nécessité d'avoir du Canon. Dans le cas contraire, il en faudrait. mais l'on pourrait s'emparer de ceux du fort de *l'anse à la graisse*, s'il n'était pas possible de s'en procurer convenablement. on pourrait encore détacher cent hommes qui en trouveraient aux Illinois sur la partie espagnole.

Cependant j'aimerais beaucoup mieux n'être retardé aucunement depuis le moment du départ, jusqu'à l'arrivée

Comme l'on ne se sert presque pas de fusils de munition, et que les fusils à deux coups sont préférables pour ces sortes de campagne, je conseillerais d'en embarquer quelques centaines que l'on ferait aisément rendre au Kentucky comme objets de commerce. Ces fusils serviraient à armer, non pas les Américains qui ont tous d'excellentes carabines, mais des français et des Canadiens que l'on recruterait avec facilité

J'oubliais de dire qu'il ne faudrait pas manquer d'emporter un certain nombre de lettres de marque pour corsaires, car dès l'instant que l'on serait maître du port de la N<sup>le</sup> Orleans, on pourrait faire sortir plusieurs bâtimens armés en course, qui s'enrichiraient bien vite par de nombreuses prises faites sur les côtes de la *Vera Cruz* et sur celles de Campêche

Du nombre des six personnes qui partiraient de France, il serait urgent d'en faire descendre une, avant même que l'expédition fût à moitié formée. La personne suivant moi, la plus propre à cette manoeuvre serait incontestablement un de mes amis actuellement à Paris, et nouvellement parti du Mississipi. Quoiqu'elle soit au dessus d'une fortune ordinaire, et qu'elle ait femme, elle se consacrerait avec joie au service de sa patrie. Son occupation après son arrivée, serait d'étudier à fond la colonie, et de s'aboucher avec plusieurs habitans de la basse Louisiane, mais principalement de sonder, ou faire sonder la partie de la garnison française. il lui serait d'autant plus aisé de jouer son rôle qu'il a dans ce moment un Passeport espagnol, et qu'il pourrait faire passer chez certains habitans toutes les découvertes qu'il aurait faites, découvertes qui seraient très utiles à l'armement dans sa descente.

Il me serait impossible d'établir un juste aperçu des dépenses qu'exigerait cette expédition ; elles ne seraient cependant pas exorbitantes puisqu'il ne serait pas nécessaire d'habiller le monde, et qu'il n'y aurait pas beaucoup d'armes à acheter. L'on serait obligé, par exemple, de dépenser beaucoup en boissons ; car les Américains ne parlent guerre d'affaire que vis à vis d'une Bowle.

Ce qui doit surtout contribuer à la réussite de l'entreprise, c'est la

plus grande diligence. ainsi donc si Le Conseil la juge salutaire et avantageuse, il ne saurait l'accélérer trop tôt. Ce n'est pas non plus la dépense qui doit retenir, puisque la nation y bénéficiera au moins de cent pour un, et que cette Colonie rentrant sous les loix de sa première mere, forcera peut être l'Espagne à des armemens nombreux pour garder Le Mexique. D'ailleurs Les Louisianais ne sont ni anglais ni Espagnols, ils sont français et mille fois plus attachés à la France qu'on ne saurait exprimer.

Voilà à peu près mes observations auxquelles Les circonstances doivent donner ou plus de force ou du changement. Si je n'ai pas la vanité de croire qu'elles doivent être la Boussole de l'opération, j'ai du moins celle de croire qu'il n'y a personne qui se portera avec plus d'ardeur à servir sa patrie que moi

P<sup>e</sup>. LYONNET.

V. BRISSOT TO CITIZEN ———.

(Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Espagne, Vol. 635, doct. 295.)  
Citoyen<sup>1</sup>

Je vous adresse Le Capitaine Imlay Americain de L'état de Kentucky, qui m'a été recommandé par L'estimable Cooper de Manchester, il desiroit s'entretenir avec moi de L'expédition du Mississipi, Il me paroît très propre à vous donner Les renseignemens sur Le manière de mettre ce plan à execution. Lorsque vous L'aurez entretenu, nous fixerons un jour avec Le Ministre pour avoir une Conference generele sur cet objet. Croyez moi tout à vous

J. P. BRISSOT<sup>2</sup>

le 26 Mars 1793.

VI. LYONNET TO MINISTER [LEBRUN].<sup>3</sup>

(Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Espagne, Vol. 636, folio 37.)

Citoyen Ministre

Le Citoyen Lyonnet a l'honneur de vous exposer que le Citoyen Otto est en possession des renseignemens les plus certains sur l'état actuel

<sup>1</sup> Endorsed : " 26 Mars 1793."

<sup>2</sup> In his report on the Girondin deputies, July 9, 1793, Saint Just declared : " L'attention de Brissot s'étendit dans l'autre hémisphère. Brissot dominait le conseil" (Stephens, *Orators of the French Revolution*, II. 487, 232, note). He was influential in securing the appointment of Lebrun to the foreign office and Genet to the United States (Dewitt, *Jefferson*, Paris, 1861, p. 224). He was interested in the commercial possibilities of the Mississippi Valley, and reported the feeling of the West against Spain. See J. P. Brissot de Warville, *Nouveau Voyage dans les États-Unis de l'Amérique Septentrionale, fait en 1788*, Paris, 1791. A translation was published in London, 1792 and 1794. He was designated by the Comité de Défense Générale, on January 25, 1793, to present a report on the possibility of an expedition against the Spanish dependencies (*dans les établissements espagnols*) ; Aulard, *Recueil des Actes du Comité de Salut Public*, II. 10 ; III. 82.

<sup>3</sup> Endorsed : " Reçue le 4 avril 1793."

de la Louisiane, les moyens de la soustraire au joug espagnol, et la certitude de la réussite ; Et que le Citoyen Brissot est également au cours de tous ces renseignements. Ils vous auraient déjà présenté et leur plan d'opération, et les trois personnes qu'ils ont jugé nécessaire de faire passer d'Europe en Amérique pour cette grande entreprise, si la multiplicité de vos occupations ne vous eût empêché de vous occuper de ce projet, et d'y apposer votre sanction.

Cependant les personnes proposées restent dans l'incertitude si cette affaire aura lieu ou non, et n'osent se livrer à aucun genre de vie sans connaître les intentions du Citoyen Ministre. Il est même à craindre que par un trop grand délai ; l'on n'arrive à l'arrière saison sans avoir fait les préparatifs nécessaires. Cette entreprise n'est pas de celles qui demandent beaucoup d'hommes et beaucoup d'argent. avec quelques moyens pécuniaires, il est certain qu'elle réussira, et que la France sans exposer une seule tête, portera un coup désastreux à l'Espagne.

Daignez, Citoyen Ministre, dérober à vos occupations, un instant pour sanctionner un projet également glorieux et utile à la France, et croire que la reconnaissance des Louisianais pour le premier Patron de leur liberté sera aussi durable, que votre nom qu'ils se plairont de transmettre à la postérité la plus reculée

P<sup>e</sup> LYONNET.

VII. LYONNET TO OTTO.

(Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Espagne, Vol. 636, folio 101.)

Lyon Le 21 avril 1793

Citoyen

J'ai l'honneur de vous écrire de Lyon au Sujet de l'affaire à laquelle je devais être employé. Dans le cas qu'elle n'aurait aucune réussite, et comme il est très important que je sache à quoi m'en tenir, je vous prie de vouloir bien m'instruire des événements.

Comme Le Ministre doit avoir à sa disposition plusieurs places que je pourrais être à même de remplir, je prens encore la Liberté de vous recommander mes intérêts. votre affabilité, et les honnetes, Sans nombre dont vous m'avez comblé, ne me permettent pas de douter de vos intentions bienfaisantes à mon égard

P<sup>e</sup> LYONNET

[Addressed]

Au Citoyen Otto.  
Hôtel du Ministre des  
Affaires étrangères

*Paris*

## VIII. LYONNET TO OTTO.

(Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Espagne, Vol. 636, folio 205.)

Lyon le 22 May 1793

Citoyen Otto.

Citoyen

J'eus l'honneur de vous écrire quelques jours après mon arrivée à Lyon ; mais soit que ma lettre ne vous soit pas parvenue, ou que vos occupations ne vous aient pas laissé le loisir de me faire réponse, je Suis encore à savoir sur quel pied se trouve L'opération d'outremer. Je souhaiterais néanmoins bien ardemment savoir à quoi m'en tenir. voilà plus de deux mois que je n'ose me livrer à aucun genre d'industrie, et vous savez quelles sont les dépenses d'aujourd'hui.

Daignez, Citoyen, par une lettre me tirer de cet état de perplexité, et vous m'obligerez infiniment. j'ai reçu une lettre du Capitaine Imlay qui ne m'apprend aucun changement, mais qui ne désespère pas de la réussite.

Il n'y a rien de nouveau dans cette grande ville, ni dans les departemens Limitrophes.

Votre très affectionné concitoyen

LYONNET

## IX. VIEW OF GENET'S CONDUCT.

(Archives des Affaires Étrangères, États-Unis, Vol. 39, folio 144.)

Exposé succinct<sup>1</sup> de la conduite du Citoyen Genet dans les Etats unis de l'Amérique.

Par les Instructions qui ont été données au Citoyen Genet Ministre plénipotentiaire de la République près des Etats-unis, il lui est particulièrement recommandé,

- 1.° de maintenir et de consolider la bonne intelligence qui subsiste entre les deux Nations ;
- 3.° de négocier un *nouveau Traité de Commerce sur des Bases mutuellement avantageuses* ;
- 3.° d'engager, s'il est possible, le Gouvernement Américain à *Faire cause commune avec nous* ; du moins à nous Fournir des approvisionnements jusqu'à la concurrence du montant de la Dette Américaine ;
- 4.° d'exciter secrètement les habitants de l'intérieur de l'Amérique à descendre le Mississipi, et à donner *l'indépendance aux Louisianais* ;
- 5.° enfin d'entretenir quelques liaisons avec les Canadiens pour les engager à secouer le joug de la Grande Bretagne.

Les vents n'ayant pas permis au Citoyen Genet de prendre directement la route de Philadelphie, il débarqua à Charleston, dans la Caroline du Sud. Il y fût reçu avec le plus vif empressement et les acclamations plus Flatteuses. Un Ministre de France décoré du beau titre de Républicain, et joignant un extérieur agréable à de *grands talens populaires*, ne pouvait l'être autrement.

Mais ce brillant accueil paraît dès le commencement avoir ébloui le

<sup>1</sup> Endorsed : " sans date, vers Octobre, 1793."

Citoyen Genet. se livrant sans réserve au zèle ardent qui l'anime, il interpréta trop Favorablement les témoignages d'attachement dont on le comblait à l'envi. Eloigné de deux cent lieues du siège du Gouvernement, n'étant pas encore reconnu comme Agent public, et ayant sous les yeux la proclamation de Neutralité du Président des Etats-Unis, il Fit *armer de son autorité privée quatre Corsaires* pour tomber sur tous les Batimens Anglais qui se trouvaient dans les ports voisins, ou dans celui de Charleston. Il distribua pour cet effet les Lettres de marque qui lui avaient été remises en blanc par le Ministre de la Marine, mais dont suivant l'esprit de ses Instructions, il *n'aurait dû se servir qu'après avoir obtenu l'assentiment du Gouvernement Américain*. Ces Corsaires Firent bientôt des prises, et repandirent la consternation dans tous les ports.

Sur toute la route, depuis Charleston jusqu'à Philadelphie, le Citoyen Genet Fut traité avec la même distinction. Les Fêtes, les adresses marquaient par tout l'époque de son arrivée. *Ses manieres insinuanes, son ELOQUENCE*, lui attiraient les applaudissemens de tous les amis de la France. Un cortège nombreux de Citoyens de Philadelphie vint le recevoir a 4 milles de la ville, et le conduisit en triomphe à son logement. Les adresses patriotiques, les réponses brûlantes se succéderent rapidement ; et un Spectateur peu instruit, aurait cru que Genet *allait gouverner*, et non négocier avec les Chefs des Etats Unis.

Washington le reçut avec cette *gravité* que donne l'habitude de diriger les affaires d'un peuple libre. Le sang froid de Jefferson et des autres officiers du Gouvernement, également circonspects et surveillés de près par les Ministres des puissances coalisées, contrasta étrangement avec les effusions de joye sincères d'une portion du peuple Américain. Etonné de cette conduite, Le Citoyen Genet l'attribue à l'aristocratie du Gouvernement qu'il accuse entre autres d'avoir reçu une lettre de recommandation du prétendu Regent de France, en Faveur de Noailles.

pour expliquer la conduite de Washington et la méprise de Genet, il convient de Faire connaître la situation actuelle des partis dans les Etats unis.

Le Congres qui pendant la Révolution, avait été le centre des opérations les plus importantes, tomba dans *le mépris* tout de suite après la paix. Insensiblement chaque Etat se remit en pleine jouissance de sa Souveraineté, La Confédération n'existait plus, et l'on était à la veille d'une guerre civile.

En 1788, on adopte une nouvelle Forme de Gouvernement composé d'un président, d'un Sénat, et d'une Chambre de Représentans. Ceux qui soutenaient cette nouvelle Forme de Gouvernement, Furent appelés Fédéralistes, et leurs adversaires antifédéralistes. Les anciens Torys et les Quakers joignirent les Fédéralistes, et leur donnerent une grande majorité. Les *Antifédéralistes se soumirent insensiblement*.

L'arrivée du Citoyen Genet *paraît avoir réveillè le zèle de ces derniers*. Ce Ministre voyageant précisément à travers les Etats où ce parti est tres nombreux, se fit illusion sur le caractère véritable du Gouvernement Américain : il crut voir un germe de Révolution où il n'y avait réelle-



ment que quelque mecontentement, et beaucoup de jalousie. Il se considérait comme soutenu par le peuple contre le Gouvernement même. C'est dans cet esprit qu'est conçue sa dernière dépêche, N° 4.

D'après cette Dépêche, les armemens continuaient. Sept Corsaires étaient déjà en mer ; et pour achever de *violer la neutralité des Etats unis*, Genet préparait à Philadelphie une expédition *par mer contre la Nouvelle-Orleans* :

L'égarement de ce Ministre est d'autant plus étonnant qu'il aurait dû savoir que le Gouvernement Seul, et non une portion du peuple qui le Flagornait, pouvait lui procurer les avantages qu'il était chargé de solliciter ; que les Chefs du Gouvernement ayant été unanimement élus par le peuple, *au mois de Novembre dernier*, devaient jouir de la confiance entière de la majorité de la Nation ; et qu'en s'avisant de lutter contre ce Gouvernement, il attaquait la Nation elle-même.

Il résulte de ces observations que, par un zèle trop ardent, le Citoyen Genet a mis le Gouvernement Américain dans la nécessité de traiter avec Froideur le Représentant de la République Française ; *de désavouer en Angleterre les mesures hardies prises par ce Ministre ; et de neutraliser tellement le territoire des Etats Unis*, qu'il est à craindre que nous ne puissions plus tirer autant de Subsistances qu'autrefois de ce pays là.

Les amis du Citoyen Genet ont fait publier dans les gazettes de Philadelphie que ce Ministre n'a agi que d'après les *Instructions du Conseil Exécutif de France*. Il importe à la République de désavouer formellement cette assertion, et de déclarer au Gouvernement des Etats-unis que son Ministre, entraîné par un zèle indiscret, a outrepassé les pouvoirs qui lui ont été donnés.

Il est vraisemblable que des mal intentionnés, mieux instruits que le Citoyen Genet de l'esprit véritable du peuple Américain, *l'ont entouré à dessein d'une fausse popularité pour le rendre désagréable au Gouvernement*. Ce Ministre a été trop ardent, mal conseillé, et ébloui par l'accueil qui lui a été fait : mais il paraît que ses intentions sont très patriotiques ; L'engouement même du parti dans lequel il s'est jeté, *peut être utile à la chose publique*. Ce parti est celui des *Républicains les plus chauds*, de ceux qui sont réellement dévoués à la France, et prêts à tout sacrifier pour elle. Il paraît d'après cela, *qu'il serait impolitique de rappeler le Citoyen Genet ; mais il est instant de contenir son caractère impétueux, de lui prescrire la conduite la plus mesurée envers le Gouvernement, et de le mettre sur la voie de gagner sa confiance*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The fall of Genet may have been related to that of the Girondins in general. On October 11, 1793, the Committee of Public Safety ordered four commissioners to replace Genet. Brissot, to whom, with Lebrun, Robespierre attributed the appointment of Genet, was guillotined, October 31, 1793. The instructions for the new commission to America were approved by the Committee of Public Safety, November 15, 1793, and two days later Robespierre reported to the National Convention as follows :

“ Par une fatalité bizarre, la République se trouve encore représentée auprès d'eux par les agents des traîtres qu'elle a punis. Le beau-frère du Brissot est le consul général de la France près les Etats-Unis. Un autre homme, nommé Genest, envoyé par Lebrun et par Brissot à Philadelphie en qualité d'agent plénipotentiaire, a rempli fidèlement les

X. BARLOW AND LEAVENWORTH, PLAN FOR TAKING LOUISIANA.<sup>1</sup>

(Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Espagne, Vol. 636, folio 391.)

Plan pour prendre la Louissane, sans couter rien à la nation.

La colonie de la Louissiane, bornée au midi par le Golphe de Mexique, a l'orient par le fleuve Mississippi, s'étend sur un excellent et vaste territoire parfaitement situé pour aprovisioner nos iles de tonte espèce de vivres et de bois. Cette Colonie fut établie par les françois. Les habitants, quoique peu nombreux, étoient heureux par la perspective d'un grand succès lorsqu'un de nos derniers tyrans les vendit au despote d'Espagne, reduissant ainsi un peuple paisible et laborieux à un cruel esclavage.

Rendre ce people à la liberté en lui donnant la consistance politique d'une colonie francoise, seroit non seulement une action d'humanité, mais cette operation procureroit d'immenses avantages a la nation entiere ; tandis qu'elle donneroit un grand exemple a ses voisins dans le Mexique et la Floride, exemple qui banneroit bientôt le despotisme espagnole de toute l'Amerique meridionale.

les avantages immediats pour la France seroient

1<sup>o</sup> la facilité d'aprovisioner ses iles de toute espèce de vivres et de bois de construction. Cette ressource est singulierement necessaire dans ce moment, après les horribles devastations qui sont arrivées dans ces iles, et surtout pendant que la navigation de l'ocean atlantique est devenue tres hazardeuse par l'effet de la guerre.

2. Quand la france aura besoin de bled et de farine, la navigation du Mississippi offre le moyen de se les procurer à beaucoup meilleur marché que dans les Etats unis. Les etablissemens florissans sur l'Ohio et le Mississippi en ont fertilisé les bords. les recoltes y sont abondantes ; et la nouvelle Orleans, ville principale de la Louissiane, sera un immense entrepôt, d'où la navigation à l'Europe est aussi facile que d'aucun port de l'Amerique

3<sup>o</sup> Les bois de construction se trouvent en abondance dans la Louissiane, vues et les instructions de la faction qui l'a choisi. Il a employé les moyens les plus extraordinaires pour irriter le gouvernement américain contre nous ; il a affecté de lui parler, sans aucun prétexte, avec le ton de la menace, et de lui faire des propositions également contraires aux intérêts des deux nations ; il s'est efforcé de rendre nos principes suspects ou redoutables, en les outrant par des applications ridicules. Par un contraste bien remarquable, tandis qu'à Paris ceux qui l'avaient envoyé persécutaient la société populaire, denoncaient comme des anarchistes les républicains luttant avec courage contre la tyrannie, Genest, à Philadelphie, se faisait chef de club, ne cessait de faire et de provoquer des motions aussi injurieuses qu'inquiétantes pour le gouvernement. C'est ainsi que la même faction qui en France voulait réduire tous les pauvres à la condition d'ilotes et soumettre le peuple à l'aristocratie des riches, voulait en un instant affranchir et armer tous les nègres pour détruire nos colonies."

See Archives des Affaires Étrangères, États-Unis, Vol. 39, folios 159, 255 ; and De Witt, *Thomas Jefferson* (Paris, 1861) 224, 557-559 ; Buchez et Roux, *Histoire Parlementaire*, XXX. 232, 233 ; and Stephens, *Orators of the French Revolution*, II. 487, 568.

<sup>1</sup> Endorsed : "3 frimaire 2<sup>e</sup>. An. R. 17 fin 2<sup>e</sup>. An. Espagne" [November 23, December 7, 1793].

sur tout l'espèce nommée le *chêne vif* qui est plus durable et plus recherché qu'aucun bois d'Europe pour la construction de vaisseaux. Les autres objets nécessaires à la marine, tels que le goudron, la poix, le chanvre, forment une branche considerable d'exportation du Mississippi et de l'Ohio. La colonie seule de la Louissiane est en etat de fournir dans ce genre plus qu'il ne faut pour toutes les marines de l'Europe. un autre objet, plutot de luxe que de necessité, mais qui est tres considerable dans le commerce c'est le *tabac*. Il est bien connu que les terres de l'Ohio, du Mississippi, et surtout celle de la Louissiane, sont meilleures qu'aucunes autres en Amerique pour cette denrée. Les terres de Virginie et autres anciennes provinces commencent à s'épuiser trop pour cette culture ; et la nouvelle Orleans doit être naturellement le magasin, d'où le tabac peut se distribuer à toute l'Europe.

4° Cette ville sera en même tems le plus grand entrepôt de l'univers pour les marchandises venant des manufactures de France. Si elles n'y sont pas frappées de droits d'entrée, les negotians de l'Ohio les prendront pour toutes les contrées occidentales des Etats unis.

5° À la fin de la guerre actuelle en france, la foule immense de nos militaires rentrera dans leurs foyers ; et quoique nos armées soient generalement composées de bons citoyens, l'effet naturel d'une vie militaire est de rendre les hommes oisifs ou inquiets. la République voudra sans doute recompenser ses soldats par d'autres gratifications que leurs salaires journaliers. Ne seroit il pas très avantageux de pouvoir leur ouvrir une contrée favorisée de la nature ? là ils trouveroient une occupation douce en cultivant un sol qui sera leur propriété, et en montrant un exemple de liberté à leurs voisins les espagnols. une telle operation seroit également avantageuse à la mere patrie et à ces braves guerriers qui sont les objets de sa tendre sollicitude

La force espagnole à la nouvelle Orleans, au Nouveau Madrid, et autre postes de la Louissiane, n'est, dans ce moment, que peu considerable ; mais il est possible que bientôt elle soit augmentée ; parceque ce gouvernement, jaloux et despotic, voudra s'assurer les avantages d'une colonie si attrayante. il ne peut ignorer d'ailleurs que les habitans (qui sont presque tous françois) voudroient secouer le joug espagnol, qu'ils soupirent pour la liberté, et que leurs cœurs reclament l'identité politique avec leur mere patrie. Il est donc urgent de frapper rapidement et secrètement le coup qui renversera le despotisme espagnol dans la Louissiane, et de prendre possession de la Colonie au nom de la Republique françoise.

Pour cet effet, nous soussignés proposons au Comité de Salut Public, les articles suivans

1°. Nous recevrons des commissions suffisanes pour organiser une force armée de deux mille hommes. Dans les commissions l'objet de l'expédition sera expliqué, mais les noms des officiers seront laissés en blanc pour y etre insérés par nous en Amerique.

2°.—à nos frais nous équiperons, armerons, payerons et conduirons cette force, avec laquelle nous prendrons possession, au nom de la République françoise de la colonie de la Louissiane, et nous la lui conserverons en attendant les ordres ulterieurs du gouvernement.

3° Les propriétés de tous les individus, habitans de la dite colonie (les officiers du gouvernement espagnol seuls exceptés) seront sacrées dans les mains des propriétaires actuels, et leurs personnes protégées.

4°—Toutes les propriétés appartenantes [appartenantes] au Gouvernement espagnol, tant en terres qu'en meubles, seront à nous, pour être distribuées aux entrepreneurs et aux troupes, suivant la convention qui sera faite entre eux avant l'expédition.

5°—le gouvernement intérieur de la colonie sera établi sur les principes républicains de la constitution française. ses réglemens extérieurs pour le commerce seront conformes à ceux des autres colonies françaises. Mais il est convenu, que ni la France ni la colonie ne pourront mettre obstacle à la libre navigation du Mississippi, ni des autres fleuves qui tombent dans le golphe de Mexique

6°—Si contre tout attente, il arrivoit qu'à la paix qui terminera la guerre actuelle, la France cédât à l'Espagne, ou à toute autre puissance, la colonie de la Louisiane, alors les entrepreneurs et leurs associés seroient remboursés par le gouvernement français pour les dépenses de cette entreprise

JOEL BARLOW  
M LEAVENWORTH.

ce 3 Frimaire  
l'an 2 de la République  
Paris, Maison de Bretagne—  
Rue Jacob—

#### Forme de la Commission

*Liberté*

*Egalité*

#### *Au nom de la République française*

Le conseil exécutif provisoire, en conséquence des délibérations prises par le comité de salut Public de la Convention Nationale, autorise et commet N

pour qu'il leve une force suffisante, qu'il commette les officiers nécessaires pour la commander, et qu'il se procure toutes munitions et approvisionnemens nécessaires à l'attaque et à la prise de la colonie espagnole la Louisiane ; le tout aux frais de la compagnie qui s'offre d'en faire les avances ; le chargeant par les presents de prendre possession de cette colonie *au nom de la République française*, de donner ensuite toute protection aux habitans de cette colonie qui se seront soumis ; de traiter selon les lois de la guerre tout ce qui résistera, de se concerter avec les commissaires civils nationaux qui pourront être nommés pour l'inventaire de toutes les propriétés appartenantes au gouvernement espagnol, les conserver, ainsi que la colonie, au nom de la république, jusqu'à des nouveaux ordres, et selon les conditions arrêtées par le comité de salut public et le conseil exécutif provisoire avec les citoyens qui se chargent de faire toutes les avances de cette entreprise

XI. LACHAISE TO PELEY.<sup>1</sup>

(Archives des Affaires Étrangères, États-Unis, Vol. 43, folio 194.)

Auguste lachaise<sup>2</sup> Creol  
de la Louisiane Capi-  
taine au 92<sup>e</sup> regiment  
Envoyé par le ministre  
plenipotentiaire de la  
République auprès des  
Etats Unis, Dans l'état  
du Kentucky pour y  
cooperer avec le citoyen  
Michaux agent de la re-  
publique au Succès de  
l'expédition projetée  
Contre les Espagnols de  
la louisiane, Et fait chef  
de brigade, dans la  
legion . . . . .  
revolutionnaire du Mis-  
sissipi

1<sup>re</sup> preuve a l'appuy de  
ce que j'avance dans le  
1<sup>er</sup> paragraphe  
1<sup>ere</sup>

Les Certificats des gen-  
eraux Lavaux et lasalle,  
et des officiers de mon  
Corps, les passeports des  
Commissaires Civils,  
prouvent mon grade et  
ma conduite militaire,  
et mes pertes, et les rai-  
sons imperieuses qui  
m'ont forcé de quitter  
St. Domingue

Au Representant Du peuple Peley Membre du  
Comité de Salut public, Et Chargé des Affaires  
de la Commission des relations Extérieures

Citoyen

Le 7. Aout 1793 (vieux Stile) apres avoir per-  
du dans l'Incendie Du Cap. tous mes Effets,  
mes brevets et Etats de Services, mes autres  
papiers, ma fortune Enfin, je partis de St. Do-  
mingue pour aller aux Etats unis, retablir m'a  
santé, ruinée par quatre ans d'activités dans une  
guere s'i longue, si mal dirigée, Et s'i Destruc-  
tive, Et par les maladies Suittes inevitables de  
Mes fatigues Exéssives, Sous cette zone Bru-  
lante Et . . . Meurtrierre.

Après une traversée tres longue, Et tres dur  
ou je Me vis Enlever par les Corsaires des issles  
de la providence, Mes armes, Et le foible Nu-  
meraires, que je tenais de la Générosité de mes  
Camarades, j'arrivai à Newyork le 2. 7<sup>bre</sup> 1793.  
le Ministre plenipotentiaire de la republique  
S'occupoit alors de l'Exécution du vaste plan  
D'une Expedition, contre la floride, Et la lou-  
isiane, les Certificats que je lui présentai, m'a  
qualité de louisianais, l'exactitude Des renseig-  
nemens que je lui donnai, Sur les localités de  
Ces deux provinces, Et les dispositions, de

<sup>1</sup> Endorsed "Reçu le 10. Plu. [January 29, 1795]. Enreg. N<sup>o</sup> 447. Renv. le 11  
dud."

"Citt Campy. à joindre aux pieces données depuis par la Chaise d'après la demande qui  
lui en a été faite par Boisgerlier / Cit. quivel—chercher dans la correspondance des  
renseignements Sur la chaise en ecrire, s'il y a lieu, à la com<sup>te</sup> de la mar. distinguer sa  
demande d'emploi de celle d'une indemnité pour son compagnon et remettre au cit. derville  
la partie de travail à faire à ce Sujet. Renvoyé au Commissaire des relations Ex-  
terieures pour donner son avis 9<sup>e</sup> pluviöse. l'an 3<sup>e</sup> de la R. une et indivisible Vetel."

<sup>2</sup> See *Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission*, 1896, Clark-Genet docu-  
ments 12, 59, 65, 73, et *passim*, and Gayarré, *Louisiana under Spanish Domination*,  
341; Martin, *Louisiana*, II. 123; *American State Papers*, For. Rel., I. 455; *American  
State Papers*, Misc., I. 931; Marshall, *Kentucky*, II. 117.

2<sup>e</sup> preuve  
Du 2<sup>me</sup> paragraphe

L'ordre de Genet, sa lettre à l'agent Michaux, le Certificat Du Capitaine qui m'a Conduit à Newyork, le reçu de Genioux pour les avances que je lui ai fait dans notre voyage, celui des hollandais acquereur de mes traites, le Certificat à l'appuy de ce reçu du General Clark et des officiers français servans dans la Legion; mon brevet de chef de brigade, sont les titres et les droits que je fais valoir, pour obtenir mes appointemens, depuis le 1<sup>er</sup> 8<sup>bre</sup> jusqu'au 20 juillet, époque de mon retour à Philadelphie; et les indemnités que le Comité jugera Convenable de m'accorder

leurs habitans, En faveur de la république le déterminèrent, à m'envoyer Dans l'Etat du Kentucky, pour y Cooperer avec l'agent Michaux<sup>1</sup> au Succès de cette Expedition, je partis le 2. 8<sup>bre</sup> avec le Citoyen le Paux<sup>2</sup> mon guide, Et la Citoyen Genioux, que je crus devoir associer à mes fatigues, Et à Mes Dangers, Dans ce pénible Et perilleux voyage; ce traître<sup>3</sup> m'abandonna un mois après, pour Suivre, une Vingtaine D'Emigrés qui Se rendoient à la Nouvelle Orléans, pour Se joindre, à Cinq ou Six Cent aristocrates que reçoit Et paye au poids de l'or, le gouverneur de la Louisiane; Genioux a reçue Depuis le prix de S'a trahison, arrêté Comme espion, Et comme mon agent, il a été Envoyé aux Mines; Lorsque je partis de Newyork, il ne fut pas question, Entre le Ministre, Genet Et moi, D'appointemens Et de rang<sup>4</sup>. Je N'ambitionnai que la gloire de Briser les Chaines de mes Compatriotes; devenir le liberateur de mon pays eût été mon plus beau titre, S'a reconnaissance Et Son Bonheur Eussent fait m'a plus douce recompense; je partis avec cent pistoles, Sommes Suffisante à peine pour payer, les frais D'achat de chevaux, Et Des vêtemens D'hivers, Et les dépenses de M'a route; j'arrivai au Kentucky le 20 X<sup>bre</sup> Sans un Sol; l'agent Michaux, mon unique ressource dans ce pays inconnu pour moi, venois de le quitter, pour ce rendre à Philadelphie; je me trouvai donc l'agent principal de la république. auprès de cet Etat; je crus ne pas devoir quitter mon poste jusqu'à nouvel ordre, j'avais Des raisons plus puissantes que le Citoyen Michaux, pour y rester très ferme et très actif; pour Suivre les opérations qu'avait Ebauché cet agent; il falloit de l'argent qu'il n'avoit pas se procurer, j'en avois Besoin pour payer mes Dépenses de premières nécessités, les frais de mes Voyages, Et pour Soutenir m'a représentation; j'avais Sauvé des mains Des Corsaires 2500<sup>+</sup> En traites Sur le trésor National, fruit De quatre années de Service à St Domingue Et De nulle Valeur dans le Continent, je les proposai à un hollandais Calculateur,<sup>5</sup> il les acheta pour le prix de 500<sup>+</sup> Cette

<sup>1</sup> See Clark-Genet correspondence in *Report Historical MSS. Com.*, 1896.

<sup>2</sup> De Pauw; see documents 4, 12, 73, et passim, *Report of Historical Manuscripts Commission*, 1896: Correspondence of Clark and Genet.

<sup>3</sup> See *Report Historical Manuscripts Commission*, 1896, Clark-Genet documents, 12, 26, 43.

<sup>4</sup> Contrast De Pauw's statement in document 73, *loc. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> Compare De Pauw, *Report of Historical Manuscripts Commission*, 1896, p. 1103. He says he paid Lachaise seventy-five dollars for assignats which amounted to three hundred and seventy-five dollars.



foible mais tres précieuse Somme, dans un pays ou tout est a un aussi Bas prix, Me fournit les moyens de Subsister, Et de Voyager pour le Succé de m'a mission, jusqu'a Ce que jeusse Etabli le Credit de la republique Et inspiré par m'a Conduitte Et mon zèle l'interet Et la Confiance Generale ;

Je fus assés heureux pour y parvenir, j'en apporte des preuves Satisfaisantes pour la republique, Et flatteuses Et honorables pour moi ; Dans les Differentes addresses de Sociétés democratiques<sup>1</sup> Et des principaux Caracteres de cette Contrée ; lorsque je partis de Newyork quelques Colons. . . aristocrates officieux, informerent le Ministre espagnol de mon départ, Et du Sujet de m'a mission, un aviso Et mon Signalement, Et Celui de mes Compagnes de Voyages ; furent Expédiés au gouverneur de la louisiane ; Nous fumens tous dénoncés au Gouvernement des Etats unis, aussitot, leur president Envoya des ordres, aux gouverneurs des Etats de l'ouïest, de prendre les mesures les plus Sevéres Contre Nous, les proclamations du president, injurieuses pour la peuples du Kentucky Et du Cumberland, Et celles de quelques gouverneurs, de Ces Etats n'empecherent pas mes progrées auprés d'un peuple qui connoit Ses droits, Et qui Veut en jouïr à quelque prix que ce soit ; qui depuis Dix ans Sollicite en vain Son Gouvernement qu'il appelle pusillanime Et partial de lui faire obtenir des Espagnols le droit Naturel Et Consentì, par les traités, de la libre Navigation du Missisipi ; Et qui se regarde déjà comme lié par les nœuds de fraternité, d'alliance, Et de Commerce avec les louisianais devenus français, Et français libres, Soit par le droit De Conquête, ou de revendication, de la part de la republique française ; lorsqu'elle Dictera Ses loix aux puissances Ennemies Usurpatrices ou acquiritrices des cidevant possessions françaises. Sur le seul credit de la republique, Nous levames facilement une légion Composée de 2000 mil<sup>2</sup> Kentukais de 900 français, des Etablissemens De l'Ohio, Et des illinois americains, nous gagnâmes les Sauvages Stipendiés par les Espagnol Et Envoyés à l'embouchure De l'ohio,

3.<sup>me</sup> preuve  
au 3.<sup>me</sup> paragraphe

Je prouve tout ce que j'y avance par les adresses des Sociétés democratiques et les lettres des officiers superieurs de la legion ; et du general Clark, par les avis recus des natchez et de la louisiane superieure, Consignés dans deux lettres de rigo,<sup>2</sup> habitant des illinois Americains, par la proclamation tres curieuse du gouverneur de la louisiane par la lettre de mon rappel par le ministre fauchet, et par le passeport du consul de Baltimore

<sup>1</sup> Compare *American State Papers*, Misc., I. 931, for action on Lachaise's farewell address to the Democratic Society of Lexington ; see also Marshall, *Kentucky*, II. 117 ; and document 46, *Report Historical Manuscripts Commission*, 1896, p. 1056.

<sup>2</sup> Vigo ?

<sup>3</sup> *Sic.* Compare document 56, *Report of Historical Manuscripts Commission*, 1896, p. 1072, and citations there. Clark's claims asked pay for a captain, lieutenant, and one hundred men for two months. In document 68, G. R. Clark (November 2, 1795) says :



pour nous arreter dans Notre marche ; la Société Démocratique de l'Exington Sur le Cautionnement du General clark nous avoit fourni les provisions de Bouche Et de guere, Et les Batteaux de transport nécessaires ; tout Etoit prés, le rendés-vous l'ordre General de départ Etaient donnés les troupes de tous les Cantons Etaient En marche, tous Brulants D'impatience de Si joindre aux français de la louisiane Superieure qui N'attendaient que leur arrivé pour porter les premiers coups à leur tyrans. la proclamation du Ministre fauchet, Et l'ordre officiel que je reçus de lui, de suspendre toutes operations relatives à L'Expédition, detruisirent Nos plus cheres Esperances. Nous confediamens<sup>1</sup> toutes les troupes mécontente Et désespérés ; Et je me vis privé de L'espoir Si flatteur d'être le libérateur de mon pays, Et le Vengeur De mes Compatriotes, De mon ayeul, Et de mes freres, Victimes, Des Cruautés du Barbare, orelli,<sup>2</sup> Et de leurs dévouïemens a la Mere patrie ; C'est ici le moment de dire que nos disposition, nos preparatifs, Et nos dépenses au Kintuky n'ont pas Eté infructueuses pour la republique ; Elles ont Coutés chers à l'Espagne ; le gouverneur de la louisiane En a Eté Si allarmé qu'il a Depensé plus de Six Million,<sup>3</sup> En six mois, En hérissant de forts Et De Canons la nouvelle orleans, Et En couvrant le Missisipi de Chaloupes Canonnières, Et de galérés ; les premiers ont Eté dégradés Et ruinés par les pluyes, Et les dernières Submergées par les ouragans du mois D'aoust ; En soudoyant Et fort cher une troupe d'aristocrates, Et les Citoyens de Couleur libres, qu'il a Séduis Et Egaré, En achetant d'avance, et payant Comptant, pour le Compte de Son Maitre, les recoltes des habitans Des Natchés, Et Des autres quartiers dont il n'avoit pas Voulu donner un Sol les années précédentes

“I think it unnesisary to inclose a Return of the Recruits as they ware (except one Company) never Calld to the field.” Compare *St. Clair Papers*, II. 321, and Winsor, *Westward Movement*, 539.

<sup>1</sup> Congédiames (?)

<sup>2</sup> O'Reilly. Lachaise's grandfather was the king's *commissaire ordonnateur* in New Orleans. See Gayarré, *Louisiana under Spanish Domination*, 341, and Martin's *Louisiana*, II. 123.

<sup>3</sup> In September or November, 1795, Carondelet, governor of New Orleans, wrote to Alcudia conformably to the royal order of March 4, 1794, that \$294,562 had been spent since 1791 in putting the provinces on a defensive basis. The sums paid to troops amounted to \$174,695 ; the \$294,562 were expended for fortifications ; Indian cessions ; supplying galleys for the Mississippi ; opposing Bowles and Clark ; negotiations with Kentucky ; construction of the canal to the St. John (Carondelet Canal), etc. See Draper Collection, 41 Clark MSS., 198, and *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, II. 474 (April, 1897).

4<sup>e</sup> preuve  
du 4<sup>e</sup> paragraphe

la lettre du 20. fructidor du Ministre fauchet prouve notre mission en france etablit nos titres et nos droits, et legitime la demande que je fais au Comité au nom du Citoyen fulton et au mien, d'une paye et d'une subsistance quelconque, et d'être mis a même le plutot possible dans quelque grade que ce soit, de rendre de nouveaux services a la republique.

le ministre fauchet doit avoir ecrit, à la commission des relations exterieures, sur les creances des fournisseurs du Kentuky et sur les reclamations du general Clark dont je presente les memoires et les lettres.

Je demande de plus le remboursement des avances, que j'ai fait au Citoyen fulton, depuis trois mois—elles Se montent a Sept Cens et quelques livres

Je pris donc a regret la route pénible Et perilleuse de Philadelphie à travers des déserts infectés de Barbares Sauvages avec mon fidel Compagnon D'infortune ; le Major fulton.<sup>1</sup> J'i arrivais le 20 juillet 1794, je fis un Raport de m'a Mission au Ministre fauchet, je lui donnai un memoire Sur les localités le caractere les Meurs Et les disposition favorables a la republique, Des habitans des pays que je venais de parcourir ; il jugea à propos de me faire passer En france avec le Major fulton ; Nous regardant comme tres utile a la republique, s'i Elle adoptoit un nouveau plan D'Expedition dont les opérations seroient, Dirigées Contre les espagnols des deux florides ; le Citoyen fulton a habité trois ans parmi les Sauvages de cette Contrée, il a Sur eux la plus grande influence, il parle leurs langage Et Connois parfaitement le pays, il pourroit Servir D'interprete Et de guide, il Seroit un Exelent recruteur parmi Les Sauvages, Et les americains qui forment la majorité Des habitans de la floride ; quand à moi j'ai Sur les localités de ce pays les Connoissance qu'a put me procurer un an de sejour à la Mobile, Et à pensacole, Dont j'ai fait les Campagnes Et les Sieges En 1780 Sous le general espagnol Galvès. J'appuie auprès du Comite les justes reclamations du Major fulton devenu aujourd'hui un des déffenseur de la republique ; il Subsiste à mes dépends depuis le 2. Brumaire<sup>2</sup> Dernier, Epoque de Notre arrivée En france ; il S'est acquis des droits à la justice Et à la bienfaisance Nationale par l'abandon qu'il a fait de Ses grandes propriétés dans la floride au tyran Espagnol lors quil Exigea le Serment De fidélité, Contre la republique française ; Des habitans de cette province Et de la Louisiane ; je rappellerai aussy l'attention du Comite Sur la dette Contractée au nom De la republique, avec les fournisseurs du Kintuky ; le General Clark, s'en est rendu Caution, il a Été En outre par son grade de General En Chef De l'Expédition Entraîné à Des dépenses Extraordinaires, il reclame des indemnités qu'on ne peut lui refuser

a paris ce 28 Nivose de l'an 3<sup>eme</sup> de la republique une et indivisible.<sup>3</sup>

AUGUSTE LACHAISE.

C. D. hôtel D'Angleterre Rue Montmartre.

<sup>1</sup> See *Report Historical Manuscripts Commission*, 1896, Clark-Genet correspondence, documents 51, 52, 58, 59, 61, 63, 64, 65, et *passim*.

<sup>2</sup> October 23, 1794.

<sup>3</sup> February 16, 1795.

## XII. COMMISSION OF FOREIGN RELATIONS TO LACHAISE.

(Archives des Affaires Étrangères, États-Unis, Vol. 43, folio 318).<sup>1</sup>

Paris le 17 Ventôse An 3<sup>e</sup> de la R<sup>ique</sup>.<sup>2</sup>

La Cöission des Rel. Exterieures

au Cit. Auguste Lachaise

Rue Montmartre

Hôtel D'Angleterre

Tu as adressé, Citoyen, le 28. nivose dernier au Représent Pelet membre du Comité de Salut Public, une petition dans laquelle tu rendois compte de la Mission dont tu avois été chargé dans Kentukey, et dit mouvemens que tu t'étois donnés pour assurer le Succès de l'Expédition projetée par Genêt Contre la floride et la Louisiane. tu terminois en demandant.

1.<sup>o</sup> de l'emploi tant pour toi même que pour le Major Américain fulton, qui après t'avoir accompagné dans tes voyages en Amérique, t'a suivi en france.

2.<sup>o</sup> le remboursement de diverses sommes, dont tu as joint l'Etat à ta petition, lesquelles forment un total de 8350<sup>+</sup>.

La Commission des Relations Extérieures appelée a donner son avis sur ces reclamations, a remis son travail, le 26 Pluviôse et le 5 du Courant, le Comité de Salut-Public a rendu la décision Suivante :

“ Deliberé et accordé la Somme sur les fonds Secrets à titre

“ d'indemnité.

C'est à la Commission des Relations Extérieures que tu devras t'adresser pour jouir de l'effet de cette détermination.

<sup>1</sup> Endorsed : “ Relations Extérieures, Troisième Bureau.”

<sup>2</sup> March 7, 1795. See the previous document, and États-Unis, Vol. 43, folio 191.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

*Introduction aux Études Historiques.* Par CH.-V. LANGLOIS, Chargé de cours à la Sorbonne, et CH. SEIGNOBOS, Maître de conférences à la Sorbonne. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1898. Pp. xviii, 308.)

STUDENTS of history, the authors of this volume argue in their preface, stand in need, in a greater degree than students of any other subject, of a clear understanding of the methods that they are called to employ. "In history the instinctive methods of procedure are not the rational methods," while "the rational processes of attaining historical knowledge differ so widely from those of all other sciences that it is necessary to perceive their exceptional character" in order to avoid adopting in history methods that have their only proper application in other fields. The outline of historical method which the authors have here sketched on the basis of their lectures at the Sorbonne aims to give something more definite and substantial than is to be found in works of the type of Droysen's *Historik* and Freeman's *Methods of Historical Study*, without attempting the elaborateness of Bernheim's *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode*. The first half of the book is due to M. Langlois, the second is the work of M. Seignobos.

The first part considers, as belonging to the preliminary equipment of the historian, the conditions of the transmission and collection of historical material and the means of finding it (*Heuristique*), and the various "auxiliary sciences"—philology, palaeography, diplomatics, etc.—whose usefulness depends upon the special period and subject to be studied. Book II. then takes up the operations of analysis necessary to disengage the historical fact from the "document" in which it is contained. History is not a science of observation; the historian does not observe directly the facts with which he deals, they are known to him only indirectly by the traces which they have left, either in material remains or in psychical effects which can be expressed only by means of symbols. From these symbolic representations—which, written, spoken, or pictured, constitute the great mass of historical sources—the actual occurrence can be reached only by reconstructing, in inverse order, the entire chain of operations intervening between the original observation and the symbol as we now have it. The historian must begin by assuring himself that the "document" has reached him in its original form, or in case he has to deal with a copy, by restoring the original to the extent that existing means permit; he has then to determine its time, place, and authorship, and frequently the sources from which it has been composed;

and the various related "documents" must be collected and classified. These various processes of external criticism completed, the more difficult work of internal criticism begins. For the history of men's ideas, beliefs, and state of knowledge in general, where the conception which the writer had in his mind is all that is sought, but one further step is necessary, namely the interpretation of the text, made with the fullest possible knowledge of its context and of the language in which it is written. To arrive at actual events, however, the historian must proceed to test the good faith and accuracy of the author, each of whose statements should be approached with systematic distrust at every point. The only certain results of this process of criticism are the negative results; on the positive side it can do no more than indicate the degrees of probability attaching to different individual affirmations, which cannot become scientifically established facts until verified by the concordant testimony of other "documents" representing different observations. Even then the results of historical investigation, indirect at best, cannot attain the certitude reached by the sciences of direct observation, and in case of disagreement the historian must yield to the natural scientist.

The synthetic operations necessary to construct history out of the heterogeneous materials furnished by these processes of analysis form the subject of Book III. This side of methodology has not yet received sufficient attention—for the classification of the incoherent mass of historical facts "the practice of historians furnishes no method; originating as a branch of literature, history has remained the least methodic of the sciences." History cannot imitate biology; its materials come indirectly through the medium of the imagination, imagined but not imaginary, and are described in terms that are often inexact and misleading. The problem of the historian is to re-imagine the event from the description and classify the events thus imagined under appropriate categories by means of a series of questions; the gaps that remain in each group are next to be filled where possible by inference from facts already established, and he may then proceed to construct general conclusions from the material thus arranged and enlarged and to express the results in monographs or more extended works.

In their brief conclusion the authors speak of the limitations of history and the need of a division of labor among historians and summarize their views concerning the advantages of historical study. Rejecting the old view of history as a *magistra vitae* furnishing rules for the conduct of life, they claim for it an indirect utility only. It helps us to understand the present by explaining its origins, although for this purpose the history of our own century is in most cases sufficient; it is also indispensable to the progress of the political and social sciences, which, by reason of the insufficiency of the data afforded by existing phenomena, must draw their materials in great measure from the past and in so doing must (often as they are tempted to forget it) adopt the methods of historical research. The chief justification of historical study is, however, to be found in its effects upon the mind, in inculcating a wholesome scepticism, in familiar-

izing men with different customs and with the idea of social change, and in explaining the nature of historical evolution, so different from the evolution of the animal world. The volume closes with two appendices dealing with the condition of historical studies in French institutions of secondary and higher education.

This summary will serve to show the general plan of the book, although it does not do justice to its originality of thought or its clearness of exposition. The *Introduction* is simpler and more compact than Bernheim's *Lehrbuch*, whose merits the authors acknowledge and to which they frequently refer; it omits the bibliographies, the discussions of metaphysical problems, and the numerous examples which occupy so much space in that excellent manual. On the other hand it supplements Bernheim at several important points, its analysis is often more penetrating, and it devotes a larger share of its attention to the important problems of historical synthesis. Some of the authors' statements demand fuller justification than has here been given, and some of them are sufficiently radical to provoke dissent in many quarters, but the work as a whole is a valuable contribution to the literature of historical method and cannot be read without stimulating thought and clarifying one's ideas. It is to be hoped that the demand for the *Introduction* will be sufficient to encourage M. Seignobos to prepare the elaborate treatise on historical method which he has in contemplation. He has worked out certain phases of the subject more fully in his noteworthy articles, *Les Conditions Psychologiques de la Connaissance en Histoire*, in the *Revue Philosophique*, July and August, 1887.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

*A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age.* By ARTHUR CUSHMAN MCGIFFERT, PH.D., D.D., Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1897. Pp. xiii, 681.)

THIS is the most comprehensive and the most critical work upon the Apostolic Age that has yet proceeded from the American press and an American author, and it is destined to play an important part for some time to come in the discussion of the questions connected with the rise and early history of Christianity. That it will be accepted as a standard history by American scholars and the reading public is hardly to be expected, or desired. The work may be briefly characterized as an attempt to reconstruct the history of the origin and development of Christianity in the Apostolic Age upon the lines laid down by Professor Harnack and the "modified" Ritschl school. Still there are many important things in the book to which, if we are not mistaken, Dr. Harnack will hesitate to subscribe. This is only to say, that Professor McGiffert, while agreeing in the main with Harnack, does not hesitate to diverge from him, and gives abundant evidence of independent research and critical acumen.

In the arrangement of his material Professor McGiffert has adopted

in general the scheme of Weizsaecker. But when it comes to the portrayal of the progress of Christianity his treatment is more comprehensive than that of his illustrious predecessor, while at the same time equal attention is given to the discussion of details. The work opens with a chapter on the origin of Christianity, which is treated under three heads, —Judaism, John the Baptist and Jesus. The first of these is well handled, and displays our author's power of rapid survey and of clear and concise statement. The interpretation of John's character and mission is less successful, and the significance of the Forerunner's work is underestimated. But it is when we come to the section on Jesus that the gravest defects in this entire work are disclosed. It might seem at first unfair to judge a history of apostolic Christianity by the author's treatment of the person of Christ. But since the question of the origin of Christianity and the question of its development cannot now be separated, and since the Founder of the Faith continued, or is generally supposed to have continued, to be its inspiration and impulse, there is no injustice in testing the volume before us by its exposition of the life, character and teaching of Jesus. Professor McGiffert gives some twenty pages to this theme. He begins by referring us (in a foot-note) to "the Lives of Christ and the general works on New Testament theology," adding the related works of Wendt, Baldensperger, Toy, Cone, Briggs and others. But since he does not tell us which "Lives" and which "New Testament theologies," we are left in doubt as to his views on several important points, since he is himself often rather strangely silent. For example, many recent "Lives" seek to maintain the historicity of the birth-stories as given by Matthew and Luke, and to establish the fact of the bodily resurrection of Jesus. Professor McGiffert, so far as we have observed, does not even allude to these birth-stories, presumably because he believes them to be wholly legendary. But if legendary, is it not the function of the historian of apostolic Christianity to trace the growth of the legends, and to explain their adoption by the Church? The question of the bodily resurrection of Jesus is similarly slighted. Our author says that "at a very early day . . . the expectation of a resurrection of the body had become almost universal among Christians" (p. 453). Whence came this belief? Had it any connection with the resurrection of Jesus? These questions are not unimportant and yet they are left unanswered. We are told (p. 19) that Jesus "began with the announcement of the approach of that [kingdom] for which they [the Jews] were all looking, and throughout his ministry it was this kingdom and none other, of which he spoke." But on page 21 we are informed that "in regarding the kingdom as a present reality, Jesus departed in a most decisive way from the conceptions entertained by his countrymen," and (p. 22) that his "conception of the future kingdom was doubtless due in part to Jewish influence, but in still larger part to his own experience." Now which of these statements are we to credit? Dr. McGiffert declares that "it seems never to have occurred to him [Jesus] that the time would yet come for its [the Jewish law's] abrogation" (p. 26). But what are we



to do with Christ's words to the woman by Jacob's well: "The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father" (Jno. 4: 21 f.)? Did not that contemplate the abolition of the temple ritual laws? Cf. Mk. 13: 2, Matth. 9: 14 f. and Jno. 10: 11 f. Again, by his conduct and by his words Jesus forecast the transformation of the Jewish laws regarding the Sabbath (Mk. 2: 23 f.), regarding cleanliness (Mk. 7: 1 f.), fasting (Mk. 2: 18 f.), prayer (Matth. 6: 5 f.), almsgiving (Matth. 6: 2 f.). He likewise prepared the way for a change of attitude toward the whole moral law as embodied in the Hebrew Scriptures (Matth. 5: 21 f.). Our author seems to admit as much, but says "Jesus gave no clear indication that he expected it ever to come" (p. 27). Jesus then was not alive to the real significance of his own words, and yet Dr. McGiffert tells us that he "gave utterance to a principle which *must* revolutionize the prevailing conception of the law" (p. 27)! Once more, we are informed (p. 30) that "Jesus' emphasis of faith in, or acceptance of himself, is throughout an emphasis not of his personality but of his message." This, as it seems to us, is a direct inversion of the facts and a complete perversion of the truth. For Jesus had the deep consciousness that he was come *to be* something from God to the World. He brought a message, to be sure, but it was an *incarnated* message, and therein lay its significance and power. Moreover he, the Son of Man and the Son of God, *gave his life* for the redemption of the world. This is his own interpretation of his mission, and his first disciples so understood him and in that faith the foundations of the Church were laid. But Dr. McGiffert tells us that "they thought of him only as the Messiah, and the fact that he left a church behind him, instead of a mere name, and that he is known to history as the founder of a religion and not as a mere sage or prophet, is historically due not so much to any uniqueness either in his character or his nature, as to the conviction which he succeeded in imparting to his followers that he was the one who had been promised by the prophets and long awaited by the fathers;" and "had he not stepped into the place which had for so long been waiting to be filled, and become the centre of the accumulated hopes and expectations of centuries," "he might have been all that he was as a teacher and a wonder-worker, and yet have accomplished little more than John the Baptist did" (p. 32).

Passing now to Chapter II., "Primitive Jewish Christianity," let us inquire of Dr. McGiffert as to what the disciples thought and believed concerning Jesus after he had been taken from them. We are told that "there is no reason to suppose that the disciples in the beginning had any other idea of the Messiah than that which prevailed among their countrymen in general,"—viz. that of "a man called and chosen by God,"—and "there is no sign that they thought of asking whether that idea was correct or not" (p. 54). Now it is fair to assume that the disciples shared in the main their Master's opinions concerning himself and his mission, after they had recovered from the shock of his death and been illumined by the glorious fact of his resurrection. For two years or

more they had been in the closest daily intercourse with him ; he shared with them his inmost thoughts, and sought in every way to make known to them his purpose and mission. It is not conceivable that Jesus, who had such clear insight into character, should have selected twelve men who were so dull as to be impervious to his great central thoughts concerning himself. There is no escape then from the conclusion, that the original disciples, after the resurrection, understood and interpreted the character and mission of Jesus essentially as he himself understood and interpreted them. That is not to say that their ideas were fully developed, or that they saw all the bearings of their own utterances concerning the Christ. But they did not fail absolutely to get at the heart of their Master. If this be true, then any later interpretation of the character and mission of the Christ, which differs radically from this earliest interpretation, is a perversion and corruption of Jesus's teaching. Now Dr. McGiffert tells us that "only after some time had passed did Christian thinkers begin to fill in the conception of the Messiahship with this and that content" (p. 54), so that Jesus came to be thought of "as the incarnation of deity and as the perfect and ideal man" (p. 31). Who then was so bold as to shift thus completely the centre of gravity of Christianity? Dr. McGiffert assures us that to the early disciples "Christianity . . . was Judaism and nothing more. It was not even a substitute for Judaism, nor even an addition or supplement to Judaism ; it was not, indeed, in any way distinct from the national faith" (p. 58). This is an amazing statement, and, if it be true, then we are forced to one of two conclusions : Either Jesus's teaching and Gospel were in no way different or distinct from the current Judaism of his day, or his disciples went to school to him to no purpose. If we take the former alternative, then Paul and not Jesus was the founder of historic Christianity, which certainly is distinct from the Judaism of Christ's day. Professor McGiffert does not wholly shrink from this alternative. He says that "the first recorded departure from primitive principles took place in connection with the Caesarean centurion, Cornelius" (p. 101), but the primitive disciples did not on this account "become any the less truly Jews, nor did they consciously waive any of their ancestral prerogatives" (p. 108). They still believed then that "Christianity . . . was Judaism and nothing more." Paul, however, had been some time in the field, and his Gospel was something quite different. For "not to the teaching of Christ, but to the teaching of Paul, does the church owe its controlling emphasis upon the Savior's death ; and not to the former, but to the latter, is chiefly due its recognition of him as a Redeemer from sin." Either Christ was not aware of his own true character and mission, or Paul distorted his Gospel and transformed him, the Jewish Messiah, into a world-wide Redeemer from sin. But we are hardly prepared to take either horn of this dilemma. Suppose we test the alternative of which we have spoken, viz., that the disciples went to school to Christ to no purpose. There are certain insurmountable objections to this theory. It impugns Christ's wisdom in choosing these men ; it discounts his

capacity as a teacher; it fails to account for the preservation of his deeds and words; and it violates a well-known law of the human mind. The twelve had been with him from the beginning; they had shared his daily life, and listened to his gracious words. When he was taken away, if they reflected at all, they must have found something in his Gospel besides Judaism. No doubt they fell far short in many respects in their apprehension of his teaching, but not in all respects. We are told that our "sources" compel us to write them down as "Jews in all particulars." This we deny. Our Gospels must be taken into account in forming our opinion of "primitive" Christianity. The so-called "sources" for "Jewish Christianity" are but the veriest fragments, and we are not justified in drawing our picture of the beginnings of Christianity from them *alone*. Moreover, Paul and the original apostles never differed radically concerning the character and personality of their Master. They worshipped the same Lord, and that Lord was Jesus of Nazareth,—to Paul as well as to Peter. Paul did not depart so absolutely from primitive Christianity as to change its very centre of gravity. Jesus is under no obligations to Paul for his divinity, nor even for his pre-existence.

It is not possible within the limits allotted us to proceed farther in the examination of Dr. McGiffert's book. Its good and strong qualities appear more and more abundantly, after he has passed beyond the origin of Christianity and primitive Jewish Christianity. Much can be said in praise of its treatment of many vexed questions, and in every discussion the author shows himself a keen critic who seeks only to get at the truth. No student of the Apostolic Age can afford to pass this book by, and we are only sorry that we cannot commend it in all particulars.

EDWIN KNOX MITCHELL.

*Christian Institutions.* By A. V. G. ALLEN, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1897. Pp. xxi, 577.)

THIS treatise aims to be "a summary of the church's history from the point of view of its institutions." It consists of three books, which treat respectively of the Organization of the Church, the Catholic Creeds and the Development of Doctrine, and Christian Worship. Book I. comprises nearly one-half of the whole treatise, and is a rediscussion of a well-worn theme, with some variations in the method of handling it, but with no real additions to our knowledge of the subject. After taking a "historical survey," Dr. Allen gives us an interesting chapter on Apostles, Prophets and Teachers, in which he expounds the New Testament use of these terms, and attempts to reproduce "the picture of the ministry in the apostolic age." He declares that the authoritative description of the ministry during this time has been given us by St. Paul in I. Cor. xii. 28, and that it is in substantial agreement with the accounts in the earlier chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. Our author passes to the

discussion of the subject of Presbyters, Bishops and Deacons, and then takes up the question of the Origin of the Episcopate. He adopts in general the Hatch-Harnack theory that the office of bishop was from the first distinct from that of presbyter, and that the bishop gained his great ascendancy largely through his gradual assumption of the function of administering the Lord's Supper, which grew more and more in dogmatic significance and in the reverence of the people. In the chapter on the Christian Ministry in the Second Century, Dr. Allen describes the displacement of the presbyter from his position as successor of the Apostles by the bishop, who now receded from his lofty Ignatian position as the successor of Christ. The "passing of the prophets" is then explained as due to the stress of the times brought about by Gnosticism and Montanism. Dr. Allen next takes up the Age of Cyprian and declares that he strengthened the foundations of the Catholic church "by formulating those doctrines of apostolic succession and of a mediating priesthood on which was built the later massive and imposing structure." A chapter on Monasticism, one on the Greek Church, and one on Nationality and the Episcopate, bring us to the closing chapter of Book I., which discusses the Age of the Reformation.

Book II., The Catholic Creeds and the Development of Doctrine, is the least significant part of this volume, though there are some admirable passages in the hundred pages given to this prodigious theme. Our author declares truly that "it is the distinctive feature of ancient theology, that it fastened upon the Person of Christ as the essence of the Christian faith" . . . "the Person of Christ as concentrating in Himself the new life and the light that had come into the world." And again, "the Catholic creeds assert the Divine Name, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as that which separates and distinguishes Christianity from Judaism and from every form of heathen thought, while it also embraces in comprehensive unity all that was true both in Judaism and heathenism."

Christian Worship comprises the third Institution of the Church, according to Dr. Allen, and he treats it by taking up one phase after another of the general subject. Baptism, Repentance and Faith constitute the first chapter. Then comes a chapter on the Development of Principles which Affected the Cultus. Our author says "that the prevailing tendency in the cultus of the first three centuries was homiletical or intellectual, appealing to the conscience and the reason;" but "after the fourth century . . . the material symbols assumed the predominance . . . and the Eucharist became the sole embodiment of the Christian aspiration for union and communion with God." Dr. Allen declares that the explanation of this change is not to be found so much by tracing points of affinity between Christian and pagan ritual, as by seeking for some principle common to both. The tendency which in the pre-Christian age gave birth to the heathen mysteries finally became prevalent in the Church and developed the Christian Mysteries. After the triumph of Constantine doors were thrown open as never before to the pagan world, and many persons entered the Church, whose minds were filled with heathen ideas

of worship, priesthood, sacrifices and the like. Our author has an interesting section on Dionysius the Areopagite, who "completed the preparation and clothed the growing cultus with an unearthly and almost ineffable splendor, justifying its inner principle by a philosophical appeal which went to the heart of his age." The volume before us closes with a chapter on the Lord's Supper. The author maintains that the Lord's Supper was at first organically related to the *agape*, which was the continuation as well as the commemoration of the Christ's last supper with his disciples. In the Ignatian Epistles "the eucharist is identified with the *agape*." In Justin Martyr "we have the first intimation of the Lord's Supper as a rite distinct from the *agape*." "Ignatius was the first to attach a doctrinal significance to the Lord's Supper," but he did not intend to teach transubstantiation. "The Lord's Supper was not regarded as a sacrifice in the technical sense of the word by any of the church writers of the first three centuries, with the exception of Cyprian." From these quotations it is apparent that Dr. Allen agrees in the main with Dr. Harnack on the subject of the Eucharist.

EDWIN KNOX MITCHELL.

*Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen.* Herausgegeben im Auftrage der Savigny-Stiftung von F. LIEBERMANN. Erster Band, Erste Lieferung. (Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1898 [1897]. Pp. 191.)

THE year 1897 marks a revival of interest in Anglo-Saxon history. Scarcely have we conned the pages of *Domesday Book and Beyond* when we find before us the first part of Dr. Liebermann's new edition of the *Gesetze der Angelsachsen*. The fact that this work is put forth under the auspices of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Munich exemplifies the catholic spirit of German scholarship, and shows that the Germans regard the Anglo-Saxon laws as a valuable source for the study not merely of English legal and constitutional history but of early Germanic institutions in general. A better editor than Dr. Liebermann could not have been selected. His admirable pamphlets on the *Leges Edwardi Confessoris* and on other Latin versions of the twelfth century must have convinced everyone of his ability to produce a masterly edition of the Anglo-Saxon laws; and the first *Lieferung*, which is now before us, should meet the expectations of those who for years have been awaiting its publication. It is a scholarly performance of the first rank, a monument of learning of which Germany may well be proud, and for which students of history throughout the world should be grateful. The critical labor expended in its production must have been enormous, for it is based upon the careful study, transcription or collation of more than a hundred manuscripts preserved in twenty libraries of England.

As yet it is difficult to comment upon the edition as a whole or to venture upon an elaborate review of the work, because the first part contains only the text and translation to the end of Edmund's reign. Ex-

planatory notes concerning the value and authenticity of the manuscripts and concerning the interpretation of particular passages, as well as disquisitions on the institutions referred to in the laws, will appear in the second volume, which will also contain a glossary. Doubtless this second volume will be of more general interest than the first.

All that we can do at present is to note two features which distinguish this edition from its predecessors. In the first place, Dr. Liebermann prints in parallel columns, besides the Latin version taken from the *Quadripartitus* and a German translation, the full Anglo-Saxon texts of various ancient manuscripts; and he gives in footnotes many variant readings from other manuscripts. The result is that we have in this edition much fuller and better texts, and the various collections of laws are dated with more accuracy. In the second place, he provides us with a much more satisfactory translation than that which we find in the editions of Thorpe and Schmid. An admirable innovation in the translation is the addition in brackets of explanatory words which make the meaning clearer. Owing to the brevity of the text and to the bewildering use of Anglo-Saxon pronouns, the literal translations of Thorpe and Schmid are often meaningless. Dr. Liebermann has rightly regarded it as the proper function of an editor to remedy this defect.

In conclusion, two or three trifling criticisms may be ventured. It is remarkable that this first part of the work has been published without any preliminary explanations of its scope, the signification of the different kinds of type used, etc. Probably these explanations will appear later in the form of an Introduction to precede the whole work. Meanwhile the publisher's prospectus which has been distributed would be helpful if it were bound with this *Lieferung*. The general appearance of the pages is attractive, but the rubrics are not printed in a form of type that easily catches the eye. Finally, the wisdom of placing Ine's laws after Alfred's, as they stand in the manuscripts, may be questioned; much may be said in favor of the chronological order adopted by Schmid.

CHARLES GROSS.

*The "Opus Majus" of Roger Bacon.* Edited, with Introduction and Analytical Table, by JOHN HENRY BRIDGES, Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, sometime Fellow of Oriel College. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1897. Two vols., pp. clxxxvii, 404, 568.)

THIS edition of the *Opus Majus* is certainly somewhat superior to that of Samuel Jebb, M.D. (London, 1733; Venice, 1750). It contains the seventh part, on moral philosophy, which Jebb omitted; and it separates as an appendix to the main work that section *De Multiplicatione Specierum*, which is really the third part of the *Opus Tertium*, but which Jebb interpolated between the fifth and sixth parts of the *Opus Majus* (pp. 358-444 of ed. of 1733). The new edition is provided with a full analytical table of contents, which is extremely convenient, and has a



tolerable index besides, while Jebb gave but a meagre index and no table of contents nor any running titles other than that of the whole work.

Having acknowledged the relative convenience of the new edition, we find nothing more to praise. One cannot read far in the introduction without recognizing in it a splendid example of that cool, calm, and collected ignorance which does not know the difference between cramming and learning; and before we turn the very first leaf of text and notes, we begin to lose confidence in the minute accuracy of the edition.

But nothing better can be hoped for until a complete Vatican MS. is found. Roger Bacon never published any book. He was continually rewriting, and in doing so lapsing into negligences which required him to rewrite again a part of what he had rewritten. It seems, unless he lies, which would be a gratuitous hypothesis, that he did send to Pope Clement IV. (in Rome) a complete copy of the *Opus Majus*. But lest it should be lost in transportation (see his words in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XII. 507),<sup>1</sup> he sends along with it a brief synopsis of its contents. The inference would seem to be that the copy sent was the only copy; and other remarks of Bacon support this supposition. If that one copy could be found, it would solve the difficulty. But is any competent man likely to risk his reputation by undertaking the manifestly impossible task of producing a perfect text as long as every old MS. is a rough draught and every consecutive one is a late patchwork? As to Bacon's other works, there is no reason to suppose that any of them (unless the letters to John of Paris, if they are genuine) was ever completed.

Dr. Jebb's edition of the *Opus Majus* was by no means excellent, judged by the standards of his day. Brewer's publication of the *Opus Tertium*, the *Opus Minus*, and the *Compendium Studii* was so welcome that nobody seem inclined to look the gift-horse in the mouth. It would not bear severe criticism. But that Dr. Bridges is the most surpassingly careless of all the poor friar's editors, with little palaeographical skill, is demonstrated in the *Athenaeum* of September 15 and October 16, 1897, and in the *English Historical Review* of January, 1898.

Those reviewers take the ground that the publication had better not have been made at all. This is going too far; for if Gasquet's recent search in the Vatican did not bring to light a complete MS. of the *Opus Majus*, and his statement that he has found "other interesting and important material" cannot give us much hope that he did (although the *Saturday Review* for September 18 positively asserts that the MS. originally sent by Bacon to the Pope is still in the Vatican), then it is unlikely that a satisfactory text can soon be established. In any case, the present publication can only increase the interest that will be felt in any other which should really throw a better light upon that abortive renaissance of physical science which took place in the first half of the thirteenth cen-

<sup>1</sup> The same matter is expressed in other words in Cap. XXI. of the *Opus Tertium*, which appears to be a first draught of the epistle ultimately condensed as printed in the *English Historical Review*; although no doubt Bacon subsequently determined to make a separate work of it.



tury, and of which Roger Bacon, lifted out of obscurity by the accidental circumstance of his correspondence with Clement IV., is the best-known representative. It is desirable that any further revelations concerning that interesting movement should be made in a form which should be agreeable reading to the largest possible number of physicists. Now, physicists in our days are quite out of the habit of reading Latin; and therefore we would venture to suggest that a translation of any long works should accompany the text, on alternate pages.

*A Bibliography of British Municipal History*, including Gilds and Parliamentary Representation. [Harvard Historical Studies, V.] By CHARLES GROSS, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History, Harvard University. (New York, London and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co. 1897. Pp. xxxiv, 461.)

No more timely book has of late appeared than this handsome volume. How very urgent has been the need of such a guide is suggested by the fact that among the thousands of writings noticed in it there cannot be found one scientific treatise devoted to the general constitutional history of English boroughs. Nay, there does not appear to exist a satisfactory institutional account of any single borough, much less of any town or county, in Great Britain. Important contributions have, of course, been made, notably in the general constitutional works of Gneist, Hegel and Stubbs; while here and there a valuable essay or monograph deals in a competent way with some special phase or feature of town life or organization.

For the first time in Dr. Gross's book we have a scientific bibliography of British municipal history prepared primarily for the student and not for the book-buyer. It "comprises books, pamphlets, magazine articles, and papers of learned societies" relating to the "governmental or constitutional history of the boroughs of Great Britain, including gilds and parliamentary representation. Town histories which do not deal with any of these topics, purely topographical works, and parish histories are omitted." The literature thus left out is of vast extent. Turner, for example, announces a "hand-book for buyers and sellers" under title of *Ten Thousand Yorkshire Books*; while Dr. Gross points out that in Vol. III. of Hyett and Bazeley's *Manual of Gloucestershire Literature* 337 octavo pages are devoted to Bristol alone.

The *Bibliography* comprises in all its divisions 3092 numbers, some of them of course indicating extensive sets or collections. In the more important cases the author, often at the cost of much time and labor, has indicated the character of the work or given a concise analysis of its contents, while conscientiously marking those which he has not been able personally to examine. The aid in this way afforded the student is frequently of the most painstaking and useful kind; as for instance (pp. 35-38) in listing the principal cases in the law reports relating to municipal questions; or throughout the book in giving page references to the public records, parliamentary reports and other papers.

The work opens with an introduction, prepared in the author's compact and thorough way, in which the character and state of preservation of the public records, town archives, and town chronicles are discussed, with an account of the general histories of boroughs and the histories of particular towns. Dr. Gross comments on the shameful lack of care often shown in regard to preserving the town archives. Thus according to the Historical Manuscripts Commission the most ancient records of Weymouth and Melcombe Regis were removed from a "stable in which they were deposited as so much rubbish;" and so escaped the "housemaid and the fire-grate, to whose tender mercies a considerable portion of them had been already consigned." It is also noteworthy that neither the general nor the local historians have made much intelligent use of the town records.

The bibliography itself is divided into two parts. The first part, comprising numbers 1 to 919, is classified as follows in fourteen categories: bibliographies and catalogues (nos. 1-43); general public records (nos. 44-77); general municipal histories (nos. 78-94); the Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods (nos. 95-117); the later Middle Ages, 1066-1500 (nos. 118-148); modern times, 1500-1800 (nos. 149-169); nineteenth century: municipal reform (nos. 170-284); parliamentary history (nos. 285-527); guilds (nos. 528-567); county histories (nos. 568-676); the Cinque Ports (nos. 677-705); Ireland (nos. 706-754); Scotland (nos. 755-893); miscellaneous—England and Wales (nos. 894-919). The second part relates to the literature and records of particular towns, the arrangement being alphabetical from Aberdeen to Youghal (nos. 920-3092). Some idea of the scope of the work may be gained from the fact that more than four hundred cities, boroughs, and towns are dealt with in this division.

Dr. Gross's book ought to stimulate and greatly aid in organizing the scientific study of municipal history in both America and Great Britain. Here is a vast field for research. The institutional development of hundreds of individual towns is yet to be traced; and perhaps some time we may have a general constitutional history of English boroughs. The last-named task can fall into no safer hands than those of the editor of the *Coroner's Rolls* and the author of the *Merchant Gild*.

GEORGE ELLIOTT HOWARD.

*History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, 1649-1660.* By SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER. Vol. II., 1651-1654. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co. 1897. Pp. xxii, 503.)

MR. GARDINER'S last volume, being the second of his history of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate, maintains the character of the series, which as a work of research into the annals of this period is admirable and is likely to be final. The materials unhappily are meagre. There is no good writer of memoirs; no Pepys or Horace Walpole, to

hold up for us the mirror to that momentous time. But all that there was to be gleaned, whether from English or foreign sources, Mr. Gardiner seems with indefatigable industry to have brought together. His judgment is always calm and fair, whether you happen entirely to agree with him in the particular case or not.

His first chapter deals with the phenomena of opinion at the time of the transition from the Commonwealth to the Protectorate. He sees in it a general tendency to reaction. In the case of Hobbes this is clear. Never was a philosophy more manifestly the offspring of circumstance than that of the author of the *Leviathan*. Hobbes recoils from the religious zeal of the Puritans as well as from their love of political liberty; for though it would be difficult to substantiate the charge of speculative atheism levelled against the writer in his own time, no philosophy can be practically more atheistic than one which treats religion as an engine of state. Hobbes is in both his aspects the prophet of the Restoration. Mr. Gardiner sees reaction against Puritan individualism even in the Utopias, such as that of Winstanley, designated by him as "the most thoughtful of all the Diggers who had attempted to establish community of property." "Not only kings but lords of the manor, lawyers, landlords, and a tithe-supported clergy were to vanish from the face of the country, and in the place of the existing life of competition was to be established a collectivist society in which all worked under the superintendence of elected overseers for the good of all." No money was to be admitted in that commonwealth. So there were Bellamys before Bellamy.

Passing to Ireland Mr. Gardiner describes the closing scene of that hideous struggle of races for the land, not failing to do justice to the comparative humanity of Ireton. His view of the Irish policy of the Commonwealth and Protectorate is adverse. He thinks that it gave birth to a hostile Irish nationality by its oppression of the Irish religion.

"It was this steady growth of Irish national feeling which constituted the real difficulty of the conquerors. Merely to deal with the murderers of 1641, or even with the leaders of the insurrection which followed, would have been comparatively an easy task. The murders and the insurrection were but an episode in the deplorable history of that long strife of which Englishmen took little heed. It was only in the nature of things that England should set herself against the establishment of a hostile nation in Ireland; only in the nature of things that her attempt to hinder it by main force should be the fruitful source of unnumbered miseries. It was no longer possible to resort to the intelligent policy of Henry VIII., and to govern Ireland by rulers developed within herself. Mary, Elizabeth, James, and Strafford had struck another note, each time with increasing emphasis. The Commonwealth, in its own conceit so innovating, could find no other way than to tread in the steps of its immediate predecessors."

What other course could the Commonwealth have taken? It could not have ejected the conquering race, the race of its own blood and religion, in the hour of hard-won victory. It could not have fused the two races by its fiat. It could not have constructed political institutions under which the two races would have lived in brotherly union. It

could not have encouraged the development of a Celtic and Catholic nationality with a great Saxon and Protestant colony in its flank. It took what surely was not only the natural but the right course in bringing both races by a union with England and Scotland under the rule of an Imperial Parliament. It gave Ireland free trade with England and her colonies, the want of which was, fully as much as anything else, the source of her subsequent miseries. Cromwell proclaimed freedom of conscience. Practical freedom of worship would probably have followed. The penal code was not the work of the Commonwealth, it was the consequence of the attempt of the Catholics to extirpate the Protestants in the time of James II. Ireland was rid of the intrusive Anglican establishment. Clarendon, a most unwilling witness, testifies in his *Life* in the strongest terms to the material prosperity which was developed under the Commonwealth rule, and which, if limited at first to the domain of the dominant race, would in course of time have spread. The Irish nationality which in after times gave, and is still in some measure giving England trouble, was not that of the subject but that of the dominant race. To the dominant race Molyneux and Swift appealed. The Irish parliament which in the hour of Great Britain's weakness wrested from her legislative independence, was a Protestant parliament. The rebellion of 1798 had its birthplace in Belfast.

Mr. Gardiner in the passage above quoted speaks of the intelligent policy of Henry VIII., whom he credits with having governed Ireland by rulers developed within herself. Henry VII., just seated on a tottering throne, was compelled to try something of that kind, and said that if all Ireland could not govern the Earl of Kildare the Earl of Kildare must govern all Ireland. Nevertheless by Poyning's ordinance he brought the Irish parliament under the control of the English council. If Henry VIII. tried anything like a Home Rule policy at first, he soon found it impracticable; and if he did not push the conquest like his successors, it was because his forces were absorbed by his game of ambitious folly upon the Continent. He forced upon the Catholic people of Ireland his religious innovations, adding thereby to the flames of racial those of religious war. Any idea of developing a separate Irish nationality was surely foreign to his mind.

We have just seen another nationalist movement in Ireland collapse, the people having been satisfied by land-law reform, and once more it has been proved to us that the main object of contention was not the political relation but the land.

In the case of Scotland again, Mr. Gardiner seems to condemn the unionist policy of the Commonwealth on the same ground. He deems it an ill-judged and hopeless attempt to put an end to Scottish nationality. If the union was a good thing in 1707, why was it a bad thing in 1652? There was pressure in 1707 as well as in 1652, though it was that of commercial atrophy; there was even the threat of war. Scotland, or at least her dominant party, had twice, without the smallest provocation, made war upon the English Parliament. On the second occasion the Scotch

had proclaimed Charles II. king of England and had tried to force him upon the English Commonwealth with arms. On the first occasion Cromwell, having destroyed the Scotch army of invasion, abstained from counter-invasion and from any imposition of terms upon the vanquished and contented himself with an amicable settlement. Was he after Dunbar and Worcester to put the sword back into hostile hands and allow Scotch royalist enemies of the republic and Scotch Presbyterian enemies of religious independence to make a third attack upon the Commonwealth? If you condemn a policy you must be prepared with an alternative. The freedom of the Scotch people could hardly be extinguished for the simple reason that they had not really been free; they had been the serfs of a most lawless, oppressive, and barbarous aristocracy. It is clearly attested that for the first time in the tribunals of the Commonwealth they saw the face of impartial Justice. It is not less clearly attested that the period of the union was to Scotland one of unwonted prosperity, the natural consequence of free trade with England. It is apt to be forgotten that there were then two Scotlands, the Lowland and the Highland, totally different from each other in race and language, while the Lowland Scotland was absolutely identical in race and radically identical in language with northern England. The highland Scotland under Montrose had been waging ferocious war against the Lowland Scotland, and the Lowland Scotland had failed to subdue the Highland clans. Cromwell by the hand of Monck imposed peace upon the clans and was gradually introducing among them order and civilization. Religion was in a measure set free by the Independents from the iron domination of the Kirk, and witch-burning ceased. Provisional occupation by an army was inevitable, but the strictest discipline was maintained. It is difficult to believe that the common people when they had thoroughly tasted of a government of order, peace, justice, and free trade, would have been desperately bent on returning to heritable jurisdictions, courts which had no justice for "kinless loons," bands of manrent, commercial atrophy, and Highland raids.

Mr. Gardiner invokes the memory of Bannockburn. But since Bannockburn much had happened. The two sections of the Anglo-Saxon race, united by their Protestantism, had stood together against the Armada. The Scotch had themselves proposed to Elizabeth a Scotch marriage and a union of the kingdoms. The crowns, and to some extent the nations, had been united. Englishmen and Scotchmen had conquered together at Marston Moor. Is not the talk of Bannockburn after all rather modern, like the Highland costume which, in its present form, appears to have been the work of a tailor attached to the army of General Wade? This is an age of historical revivals and of the resurrection of racial feuds. Scotch character, as we now see it, is largely commercial, and so far as it is commercial its formation must be subsequent to the Union.

New light is thrown by Mr. Gardiner on the war with Holland, the cause of which he finds, not in the Navigation Act, but in the English practice of the old rule of war which made an enemy's goods liable to

capture on board neutral ships. Behind all was the insane desire which the ruling party in England had conceived of uniting the two Commonwealths. Mr. Gardiner shows the disadvantage at which the Dutch were, as the owners of an immense mercantile marine, exposed to English attack, while the mercantile marine of England was small. Tromp is his hero; he rather disparages Blake. Blake was a student at Oxford till he was twenty-eight. He then became a politician and a soldier. He was fifty when he took command at sea. But it is not likely that the tradition of the British navy about the heroic father of its tactics is unfounded.

Mr. Gardiner is no doubt right in saying that Cromwell's ejection of the Long Parliament was popular. The Parliament had become selfish and corrupt, while its Dutch war had added to its financial embarrassments and forced it again to resort to confiscation. But the manner of the ejection and the insulting language addressed by Cromwell to men whose commission he held were most unwise and seem to show that he was not always master of himself.

Mr. Gardiner's account of the Barebones, or as he more respectfully calls it, the Nominative, Parliament, is nearly identical with that given by Mr. Masson, whose history, excellent if it were only disentangled from the biography of Milton, we must not forget in praising that of his successor. There was a conflict between a progressist and a moderate party. The progressists wanted not only to reform but to abolish the Court of Chancery and to do away with all state provision for the clergy. This was too much, and Cromwell had to give the word for abdication.

There followed the constitution embodied in the Instrument of Government. This Mr. Gardiner has duly analyzed. But we should like to see him compare its probable working, had it been allowed fairly to come into operation, with that of the party and cabinet system to which he seems to look forward as the ultimate and happy goal. He has pointed out that the Protector under the Instrument of Government was not absolute, but shared his power with the Council of State, and that inability always to carry the Council with him may account for some of his apparent vacillations.

Mr. Gardiner adheres to his view of Cromwell as a man of supreme ability and iron resolution in dealing with the actual situation; but as rather led by events than shaping them and without a determinate plan. Cromwell's original motive for taking arms had been rather religious than political. He was not a revolutionist or in principle a republican. He was always working back to something like the old constitution purged of the Stuart abuses, with a religious liberty for all Protestants and large measures of practical reform. He owed his power to the army and held it by the sword. This, Mr. Gardiner truly says, was his weakness; yet it is always to be borne in mind that no man could be farther than Cromwell from desiring to be a military despot, that circumstances compelled him, in Marvell's words, "still to keep the sword erect," that his use of the army as the support of his government was purely pro-



visional, while the army itself was not a praetorian guard, but a political party in arms; for the political character had extended to the whole of it, whatever its original composition may have been. An obstacle to general acquiescence in Cromwell's government not less serious than its military origin was its origin in regicide. The effect of *Eikon Basilike* had been tremendous. Had Charles I., instead of being beheaded, been forced to abdicate or formally deposed and let go, he might not have been much more formidable at Breda than James II. was at St. Germain. But no cavalier, not even any monarchist Presbyterian, could acquiesce in a regicide protectorate. What boundless fury the execution of the king had kindled was seen when a man so respectable as Clarendon could countenance conspiracies for the murder of the Protector.

Cromwell's foreign policy evidently was a union of the Protestant powers under his leadership, he taking the place held by Gustavus Adolphus and by the great Protestant statesmen in the council of Elizabeth. This Mr. Gardiner thinks was an anachronism, the era of religious war having been closed by the treaty of Westphalia. But the Protestants of Savoy and France were still in need, those of Savoy were sorely in need, of a protector. Louis XIV. and the revocation of the Edict were still to come. Mr. Gardiner says that Spain had burnt her last Protestant. But Lord Stanhope witnessed an *auto-da-fé* including heretics as well as Jews on a hideous scale in Majorca in 1691, and it is believed that even in the beginning of the present century there was an *auto-da-fé* in Mexico.

The Protector's conduct in making war on Spain without definite cause or a regular declaration seems clearly to deserve Mr. Gardiner's censure. It could be explained only on the principle, practised by Spain herself, of no peace beyond the line, coupled with the notion that she was the Apollyon against whom Christian was bound always to war. Alliance with France, who was at war with Spain, Cromwell thought would enable him to protect the Huguenots.

There is a remarkable passage in the chapter comprising the negotiations about Dunkirk. "In our day a proposal to occupy a fortified post on the opposite side of the Channel and therefore assailable by Continental armies, would be reprobated by all Englishmen without distinction of parties as a wilful throwing away the advantage of the moat placed by nature round the island state." It is curious to see how deeply rooted is the idea that the British realm is an island and enjoys insular security from attack. On the American continent alone Great Britain has now an open frontier longer than that of any other military power, and instead of enjoying insular security from attack she is assailable in every part of the globe, while she is so far from being self-contained that a few weeks of blockade might reduce her people to famine.

GOLDWIN SMITH.



*France under Louis XV.* By JAMES BRECK PERKINS. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1897. Two vols., pp. xii, 496; xii, 488.)

IN his *France under the Regency*, published six years ago, Mr. Perkins promised these volumes and indicated their theme—the decay of the institutions of France and the loss of her prestige in a half-century which saw her commerce rapidly expand, her resources increase, her thought become vigorous and creative. This theme is developed in narratives of the nation's fortunes in war and diplomacy, and in descriptions of the appearance and disappearance of statesmen and mistresses during the slow years of Louis Fifteenth's ennui. Mr. Perkins has a charming way of describing all these things, which lures on one's curiosity from page to page. He has worked with the documents in his hands, and this accounts for the clearness of his impressions, and after he has acquainted himself with the elements of a story he knows how to tell it. When, however, he leaves narrative to sketch conditions of society and tendencies in the national life, his hand is not so firm. One feels the lack of perspective, of unity, of proper setting.

The remarks in the opening chapter about French indifference to local government may serve as an example of this defect. They show no recognition of the controlling influence exerted by the geographical situation of France, which, since the forces of reorganization began to be effective in the Middle Ages, constantly diminished local independence and rendered impossible a development of local government of the New England sort, which Mr. Perkins so much admires. France had no choice in the matter. The dominant fact was the sea, the Pyrenees, the Alps—her reason for unity. Deprive her of this and, like Poland, she would have become an excellent field for feudal decentralization and a destined victim for ultimate partition among neighboring states. Such a question as that of local government cannot be intelligently treated without taking account of geographical conditions.

But does not Mr. Perkins err in his statement that the majority of Frenchmen were indifferent to the delights of local self-government? If they were, how would he explain the provincial assemblies of 1787, the general demand in the cahiers of 1789 for a larger measure of local autonomy, and the embodiment of this desire in the constitution of 1791? The war against all Europe in 1793 with "federalism" in the departments, cured the French leaders of their love for the theory, and they returned by way of the representative on mission, the national agent, and the prefect, to a system of centralization necessary, however undesirable from many points of view.

The greater part of this work is filled with the story of foreign affairs, the wars of the Polish and Austrian Successions, and the Seven Years' War, with their direful consequences to the international position of France. Mr. Perkins is inclined to be contemptuous toward "shallow-pated courtiers" who mistook for grand policy echoes of Richelieu's

schemes, and toward a king who did not wish to make peace like a merchant. Indeed, he is more French than the French in his indignation over the unnecessary humiliations to which the country was subjected by reckless or stupid leadership. Perhaps this sensitiveness has obscured his view of the difficulties which confronted the French statesmen of the day. To illustrate—he contends that they continued the war of the Austrian Succession after the election of the Emperor Francis I. and the treaty of Dresden had removed all further hope for the triumph of the French policy, mainly to carry out the agreement with Spain provided for in the Treaty of Fontainebleau. To prove this he quotes from the diplomatic correspondence between France and Spain. “I have the establishment of Don Philip as much at heart as your Majesty,” wrote Louis to his uncle Philip V.; and the minister of foreign affairs added, “You will see that it is all for the advantage of Spain, but His Majesty makes no distinction between the interests of the King of Spain and his own.” This was exceedingly tender and polite, but what of it? When the French made the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle they carried out their promise to Spain only so far as it was practicable to do this, and in spite of Spanish wrath at what was deemed a breach of faith. Moreover, in their efforts to do something for Don Philip, the French diplomatists were attempting to pursue a justifiable policy of state-building in Italy, which should substitute French for Austrian influence in the peninsula; they were not sacrificing France to their solicitude for the Spanish queen’s motherly ambitions. But Mr. Perkins regards this scheme of Chauvelin and d’Argenson as untimely. Even if such a plan were not worth fighting for, much can be said in support of the view that the last campaigns of the war were necessary to conquer a tolerable peace. In fixing his attention on Marshal Saxe’s brilliant victories in the Low Countries, Mr. Perkins does not seem to give sufficient weight to the fact that England had gained control of the sea and threatened with destruction the French colonies and commerce. It is worth noting that Captain Mahan believes that the condition of the sea power at the time accounts for the apparent lack of results advantageous to France that came out of the war.

Mr. Perkins remarks by way of conclusion to the instructive chapters on Dupleix and the Loss of an Eastern Empire that the failure of the French enterprises was partly due to their being undertaken through chartered companies. To support this conclusion, he relies on Adam Smith’s well-known discussion. But while Adam Smith’s observations are pertinent to the subject, they should not blind us to the fact that England and Holland have owed their colonial empires to just such companies. The main difference was that the English and the Dutch knew how to manage a company and the French did not. And the English, in spite of Adam Smith, are still pursuing the same policy with excellent results in Africa, of which the South African Chartered Company is a shining example.

About a third of his last volume Mr. Perkins devotes to a description of the intellectual and social changes and to the influence of literature. Here

again there is so much of interest to praise that criticism seems to argue a lack of a sense of proportion, but a word or two should be said about his description of Rousseau's *Contrat Social*. As a résumé it is well enough, but it lacks an adequate statement of the historical significance of the book. Whether Rousseau altogether intended it or not his *Contrat Social* was a counterblast to the assertion of the lawyers that the king was a sovereign absolute in his authority. The king's will has the force of law, said the legists; the law is the expression of the common will, declared Rousseau. Everything in all our states belongs to me, wrote Louis XIV.; the king is merely a commissioner who may be dismissed at any time, Rousseau replied. If his theories disturbed the placid faith of the men of 1762 in the divine right of kings, they served their historic purpose, and the question of their soundness or unsoundness is a secondary matter.

In these volumes Mr. Perkins concludes his study of the old Bourbon monarchy from the death of the most brilliant of the dynasty to the death of the most despicable. Will he also undertake the Revolution?

HENRY E. BOURNE.

*The War of Greek Independence, 1821 to 1833.* By W. ALISON PHILLIPS. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1897. Pp. vi, 428.)

WE take up this book with serious concern. Is it another cake half-baked to be thrown on a momentary market; or is it a just, adequate and readable account of the struggle which brought Greece back into the family of living nations? For such a history the English reader has waited hitherto in vain; and there never was a time when it was more sorely needed. If in this work the Senior Scholar of St. John's College, Oxford, has measured up to his opportunity, he is to be acclaimed and crowned.

At the outset he is disappointing. He gives the impression of dealing with his subject at too long range. The Greek sources are practically ignored. Not a word between these covers betrays any knowledge of Spyridon Trikoupes' four-volume history; while the performance of Prokesch von Osten is in constant requisition. Yet one would think the Greek statesman, describing as eye-witness and participant the uprising of his own people, were as well worth reckoning with as the Austrian minister at Athens (1834-1849), in his character *als eifrigster Vertreter der Integrität der Türkei*, compiling a diplomatic history of the struggle mainly to vindicate the Eastern policy of his master Metternich. Use is made of another contemporary history also written at Athens—that of George Finlay; but strangely enough only of the edition of 1861, although Finlay rewrote the work after that date, and for his matured views one must go to Tozer's edition of 1877. Gordon's contemporary work is cited from time to time; but Dr. Howe's *Historical Sketch* (1828), abounding as it does in most graphic first-hand portraits of the chief ac-

tors, is quoted but once (p. 171) and then under the name of Dr. S. G. Home. The author's main reliance seems to be Mendelssohn-Bartholdy—undoubtedly the fairest, as he is the most genial, historian of the Revolution, but in no sense a first-hand authority. Now it would seem that an Oxford scholar, undertaking even a popular account of a movement that has profoundly affected and still affects the history of Europe, might fairly be expected to go back to the original sources when they lie so near at hand.

A more serious shortcoming, however, is a certain lack of background. The Greek struggle can never be understood without a vivid view of the four hundred years of Turkish domination behind it; and this Phillips' opening chapter of eighteen meagre pages is quite inadequate to give. But even in this brief sketch it is well-nigh incredible that we have not one word about the crowning iniquity of Moslem rule—the blood-tribute of Christian children, which stirs the soul even of the phlegmatic Finlay.

It may be due to this lack of perspective in the author's own vision, that in his earlier pages he is always putting the Greeks in the wrong. Thus, in the matter of barbarity, the Greek is a butcher whose innate lust of blood is calculated to bring out the unstrained quality of Moslem mercy. The reader is not warned of the normal result of four hundred years' schooling under the Moslem—of the subjection of Greeks on Greek soil to a handful of conquerors alien and antipodal to them in race and religion and civilization, who drain their best blood for the satisfaction of their own lust and the enforcement of their lawless power—until cumulative oppression ripens its inevitable harvest in a national vendetta. Once given the historic background, and we see that in the nature of things a Greek uprising meant a war of extermination. Bearing this in mind, we can hardly acquit Mr. Phillips of something very like a perversion of history. The excesses of the Greeks are detailed with circumstance, while Turkish butcheries are but lightly touched; for example, he dwells on the bloodiest detail of the sack of Tripolitza, while he ignores the refinements of Moslem barbarity at Chios, where "even the sick in the hospitals and the inmates of the asylums for the deaf, blind and insane were butchered."

In one instance, too, there is something very like an inversion of history. Take the fourth chapter with the storming of Tripolitza as its dramatic climax; then turn to the fifth with its outline captions: "*Turkish Reprisals—Execution of the Patriarch,*" etc. "*When the news of the Greek atrocities in the Morea reached Constantinople,* the slumbering embers of Mohammedan fanaticism burst into flame and raged with uncontrollable fury. Sultan Mahmoud now wished to prove by a signal example that he *took up the challenge*. In the early morning of the 22d of April . . . the venerable Gregorios, still in his sacred robes, was led forth and hung before the gate of the patriarchal palace." *Reprisals*, indeed! What reader would suspect that the "challenge" taken up by Mahmoud on Easter day at Constantinople was not thrown down by the Greeks at Tripolitza until the October following? If *post hoc* is not

*propter hoc*, much less is *ante hoc*; and we prefer the clear ring of Mendelssohn-Bartholdy (I. 231): "Es [Tripolitza] war die griechische Antwort auf den Mord des Patriarchen."

Still, with all fair deductions, the work turns out to be on the whole a just and sympathetic history of the struggle. As the author advances in his task and warms to his subject the righteousness of the cause and the heroic devotion of the people win no stinted recognition. With incompetent and factious leadership, the immemorable bane of Greece, he has as little patience as Finlay, though his insight into the popular character with its heroic qualities which alone sustained the revolution naturally falls short of Finlay's. Yet his story of the heroic defense of Missolonghi could have been written only by one who felt the native mettle of the old Greek freeman still proof against the debasements of ages of subjection. In the brave and steadfast Miaoulis, the author discerns a modern Kallikratidas; and a true hero in Karaiskakes. His judgment of Capodistrias' régime is severely just, though the final estimate of his character (p. 372 f.) is generous. In all her vicissitudes Greece has hardly ever fared worse than under her own chosen president—a Corfiote Greek with a Venetian title who had risen by his peculiar diplomatic talents to be the czar's foreign minister, and who came back to Greece ready to play the rôle of a Greek czar if he could or that of a Russian proconsul if he must. It was in the latter rôle that he was first checked by the stern virtue of Miaoulis and finally by the pistol and dirk of the Mauromichales; and whatever else be said for him, the intrigues that cost his country a statesman-king in Leopold can never be condoned.

To British actors in the drama, whether in field or cabinet, Mr. Phillips metes out just praise or blame; and, if Cochrane and Church come off with dubious honors, and Lord Byron is not over-praised (p. 144), Hastings makes a very gallant figure (p. 259 f.) and Codrington at Navarino and after rises to the level of the grandest names in English naval history. Not that our author's account of Navarino is up to his best. As compared with the siege of Missolonghi, the destruction of Dramalis's army in the Dervenaki, and other vivid passages, the great sea-fight is rather baldly related, but the consequences of that "untoward event" are brought out with clearness and vigor. It is interesting to be reminded that "the *Times* referred to it as an outrage on a friendly power, as worse than a crime, as a blunder;" and that "it was argued at large whether Codrington should be rewarded or tried by court-martial." Had Canning lived and Codrington remained in Greek waters with proper support, the history of New Greece would have taken a very different course and England's position in Eastern Europe could hardly have come to be as humiliating as it is to-day. To disown Navarino as a blunder was the gravest blunder in modern history, but it was in keeping with the whole blundering policy of England in the East, and of the European Concert generally. "Nothing can be more certain," says our author, "than that if the question had been left to the cabinets of Europe, Greece would never have been freed. It was as a matter of fact to

the peoples of Europe and not to their governments that Greece owed her liberty. . . . In the settlement of the Greek question, it was England that acted as a drag on the counsels of Europe. . . . England in fact, through her anxiety to maintain Turkey as a barrier against Muscovite aggression, played straight into the hands of Russia. . . . The net result, then, of sixty years of British diplomacy in the East is that, at the present moment, every vestige of influence which England ever possessed at Constantinople has vanished, and Greece, which might have been a bulwark of British power in the Mediterranean, lies crushed and bleeding beneath the heel of the Turk."

After all abatements and in the face of present bankruptcy and ruin, Mr. Phillips concludes that "the Greeks are capable of making great sacrifices for the sake of a national ideal; and it is possible that, with a wider field on which to work, their conceptions of duty and patriotism would likewise expand. To maintain that the Greeks are, as a race, incapable of establishing and maintaining a powerful state, is to ignore the teaching of a long, if comparatively neglected, period of history. The Byzantine Empire was a Greek state, and, hopelessly corrupt as it doubtless too often proved itself at the centre, it nevertheless preserved civilization and the remains of ancient culture for a thousand years against the flood of barbarism which from the north and east threatened to overwhelm them. . . . And the Greeks of to-day are very much what their fathers were before them."

On the whole, the book is one to be welcomed as the first successful attempt to tell the story of the founding of the new Greek state—for it goes beyond the War for Independence, which ended in 1829 (see p. 236)—within the limits of a volume and in a style to fix and hold attention. From cover to cover there is hardly a dull page, while the narrative flows strongly on and rises on occasion to the high-water mark of historical style. Open to criticism as the book fairly is, the reader who follows to the end, as most will certainly do, will find in the author his own best antidote.

J. IRVING MANATT.

*The Sacrifice of a Throne, being an account of the Life of Amadeus, Duke of Aosta, sometime King of Spain.* By H. REMSEN WHITEHOUSE. (New York: Bonnell, Silver and Co. 1897. Pp. 328.)

WE are indebted to Mr. Whitehouse for a clever and interesting book, the best picture we have of the election and abdication of Amadeus, with illuminating sidelights from Italian history thrown upon the early and the later life of the monarch. Having had exceptional facilities for forming a correct judgment, growing out of his diplomatic career, the author has used his advantages well and given us a view of a pathetic life and of one of the most interesting episodes in modern history. The early life of Amadeus, his education, marriage, love of manly sports, military career, and what occurred after his return "home," his active



participation in public affairs, devotion to his brother, contempt of danger, popularity, are described with pleasing effect, making a charming biography of an admirable man, whom the tongue of slander never assailed in his varied and difficult experiences.

Poor Spain, a land of romance and conquests, the prey of ambitious rulers, ravaged by foreign armies, her people forced scores of times into wars without knowing for what they were fighting, and her internal affairs interfered with repeatedly by those who officiously assumed to dictate and control! Not guiltless herself of great mistakes and crimes, such as the expulsion of the Moors and the Jews, and the Inquisition, the intrigues and wrongs of foreigners have not been her sole grievances. She has been cursed with kings and queens ignorant, bigoted, unchaste, corrupt, and the strong monarchical sentiment has had the severest tests in the misrule and wickedness of those who impiously claimed sovereignty "by divine right." One of the latest and best known of these offenders was Isabella, who, brought to the throne when wholly unprepared for its high duties, and surrounded by intriguing and unscrupulous men, was led into such acts as aroused the indignation of her subjects. Montpensier, Narvaez, Serrano, and others, seduced her, step by step, into political and personal errors, until, under compulsion of revolution and party strife, she fled for refuge to France. A strong party, backed by wealth, prestige and political experience, was soon engaged in search for some ruler who could be accepted as a legitimate monarch. These monarchists were soon found to be in harsh disagreement as to the person to be chosen, when the Council of Ministers agreed upon Leopold, the Prince of Hohenzollern, and thus for awhile ended the contentions. While all are familiar with the fatal, but unnecessary, results of this choice—in the Franco-Prussian war, the disaster at Sedan, the collapse of the Napoleonic dynasty, the revolution in Paris—the full history of the negotiations of the Spanish cabinet, the action and the well-matured purpose of Prim, the *contrescènes* at Ems, have yet to be written in the light of facts, grossly obscured and perverted in state papers, memoirs and other writings.

Leopold first accepting then declining, the negotiations, which had been broken off, were opened afresh with the House of Savoy, and Amadeus, the son of Victor Emmanuel, was called to the throne, and, with many misgivings, accepted it. Mr. Whitehouse has sketched minutely the familiar incidents connected with the attempt to transport a foreign prince from his own country to the throne of an unwilling people. Despite his personal virtues and his avowed purpose to uphold the majesty of his office and govern according to constitutional guarantees, the inexperienced king found it impossible to accomplish his wishes. Political and religious intrigues, factions, a bankrupt treasury, social ostracism, the ill health of his sensitive wife and other causes convinced him of the "barrenness of his efforts, the impossibility of realizing his aims," and firmly and solemnly, for himself, his children and his successors, he renounced the crown which had been offered him by the national suffrage.



This abdication devolved the sovereignty of the nation on the National Assembly. The Republicans, at the head of whom were men of large ability and spotless integrity, after a provisional organization and the choice of an executive *pro hac vice*, succeeded in organizing the Republic. Although the transition was easy and the revolution was accomplished without violence, or bloodshed, or violation of the rights of property, or the favoring of any wild socialistic or communistic theories, yet the difficulties of government were insuperable and soon the Republic gave way to the Alfonsists. It would be a labor of love to vindicate the Republic, in its broad and enlightened statesmanship, from the persistent aspersions of prejudiced writers, but that would exceed the scope of the work under review. Not less agreeable would it be to pay the tribute of admiration to the present Queen of Spain, who redeems royalty from many of its merited reproofs, by her administrative capacity, her large intelligence, her generous charities, the purity of her life and by those womanly qualities which make her an honor to her sex.

*The Evolution of France under the Third Republic.* By BARON PIERRE DE COUBERTIN. Translated from the French by ISABEL F. HAPGOOD, with an introduction by ALBERT SHAW. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell and Co. 1897. Pp. xli, 430.)

THIS work does not purport to be strictly a history of the present French Republic. The narrative is not continuous enough, and the method of treatment is too disconnected for that. In fact, the author assumes a general familiarity with recent French politics, and the reader who has not that at command will not find the book perfectly easy to follow. The Baron de Coubertin has set to himself a newer and more interesting task, that of explaining the reasons for the course events have taken. He tries to show us why changes of ministry, which seem to the casual observer very much a matter of chance, are really the logical result of a continuous process of evolution. In this, there is much that is suggestive, though one hardly feels that the author has been in all cases perfectly successful. Surely, the fact that at times cabinet after cabinet has fallen without any sufficient reason, has been in itself the natural product of the political condition. Still the attempt to find a continuous sequence in all the political events under the Third Republic is exceedingly valuable, even if the thread at times seem attenuated.

While it is evident that the author belongs to the party of moderate Republicans which is now gaining strength rapidly among the educated classes in France, he is, in the main, just in his statements of policy, and fair in his judgment of men. He draws with an impartial hand a picture of the rule and fall of Thiers, and of the passionate struggle between MacMahon and the majority of the Chamber of Deputies. One of his few heroes is Jules Ferry, who, although never popular in the country at large, succeeded in imposing his will upon the Chamber of Deputies for a longer time than any other minister the Third Republic has had. It is,

indeed, a singular fact, and one which shows how far the parliamentary system has been from producing its normal results in France, that since the death of Gambetta no man has arisen who has been a real leader both of the Chamber of Deputies and of the nation.

The author expresses an opinion about the parliamentary system which is probably very common among thoughtful Frenchmen of to-day, when he says: "While fairly illogical in itself, the parliamentary form was better suited than any other to the century of transition, and it alone was able to guide Europe, and France in particular, from the monarchy by divine right to pure democracy." The very instability of cabinets which is commonly looked upon as a grave defect in the working of the system in France, he speaks of as the sheet anchor of the new order of things, because, he says, the French when discontented can be appeased only by the execution of a victim, and in this way the downfall of a ministry has been the means of satisfying popular rage, and thus averting revolution. He goes on to remark that the constant change of cabinets has not disorganized the administration, because a minister as a rule does not do much more than peep into the portfolio of which he is the custodian, the real work of administration being carried on by the permanent directors and heads of offices. One may perhaps be permitted, however, to question how many ministers have been sacrificed to public discontent, and how many to the mere ambitions and intrigues of groups of deputies which represent no real popular feeling at all.

In the middle of his chapters on political history the author inserts a very interesting one on "Colonial France," which will well repay careful reading. He is a strong believer in the policy of colonial expansion. In this matter he thinks the statesmen have been more farsighted than the public, who are decidedly apathetic on the subject. Yet he recognizes that the colonies acquired by the Republic are very far from being a success. This he attributes to the constant interference of the home government with the colonial administration, to its desire to extend over them the centralized, paternal, bureaucratic system of France, and in no less degree to the lack of enterprising commercial spirit on the part of the French merchants and manufacturers; in short, to the spirit of routine on the part of both government and people. He thinks that the Frenchman is not by nature a bad colonist, but that the education which he receives gives him the appearance of being so. It breaks his initiative, represses his energy, trains him to fear and obedience—in a word, shapes him to the exact reverse of what is expected of a future colonist. If this be true, to expect France to make a success of her colonies is, indeed, like expecting the leopard to change his spots.

To the ordinary reader, this chapter and the four last ones in the book which deal with education, the army, literature and socialism, will probably be more interesting than the discussion of political events. The Baron de Coubertin is perhaps a better authority on educational and social questions than on political ones; at any rate, we are not as familiar with them.

It is unfortunate that in the translation too much effort has been made to preserve French idioms. This has resulted, of course, in bad English, sometimes in sentences which are well nigh incomprehensible. On page 226, for example, this sentence occurs, "In the conservative ranks only a few rare independents expressed the indignation." On page xxxviii of the preface a passage from De Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* is translated as follows: "The ruling class of the Empire was, pre-eminently, a syndicate of protection guilty of much egotism, and with a taste which was dangerous to immobility."

A. L. LOWELL.

*A Students' History of the United States.* By EDWARD CHANNING, Professor of History in Harvard University. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1898. Pp. xi, 603.)

*A School History of the United States.* By JOHN BACH MCMASTER, Professor of American History in the University of Pennsylvania. (New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: The American Book Company. 1897. Pp. 476, 31.)

*The Student's American History.* By D. H. MONTGOMERY. (Boston and London: Ginn and Co. 1897. Pp. 523, iv.)

*A History of the United States for Schools.* By WILBUR F. GORDY, Principal of the North School, Hartford. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1898. Pp. xi, 478.)

PROFESSOR CHANNING'S book, decidedly the best one-volume American history yet published, is admirably fitted for use as a text-book with advanced secondary classes. In the preface the author has explained that his purpose in the publication of this work is to provide a text-book suited to the needs of the senior class in high schools and academies. He believes that "the serious study of American history more fitly follows than precedes other countries and belongs to the maturer years of school life." The book is not adapted to the use of young pupils. The author assumes a considerable knowledge of American history on the part of pupils from the use of more elementary text-books in the lower grades. He accordingly omits all the stock stories and anecdotes which form so large a part of our elementary text-books. The work is scholarly, dignified and interesting. It is full of suggestions for both teachers and pupils. Miss Anna Boynton Thompson of Thayer Academy has written a chapter entitled "Suggestions to Teachers" in which she has described her own methods of teaching. These suggestions will be very helpful to the teacher if he accepts them as "suggestions" and not as rules. Some of the suggestions would be impracticable with a large class. They should prove of peculiar value in preparing pupils for the new requirements for entrance to college. Especially valuable and useful are the marginal references on every page to standard works which contain a fuller account of each topic. Each chapter is headed by a list of books, special ac-

counts, sources and bibliography, maps and illustrative material. In the last are found the names of titles of books of American literature. Everything is done to stimulate and aid a more thorough investigation by the student.

The introduction is a study of the land and its resources and shows the influence of geographical conditions in the development of the country. Of the 600 pages 450 are given to the period since 1760. Considerable space is devoted to constitutional and industrial history not found in more elementary text-books. To do this the author was of course compelled to omit many topics. The military events of the War of 1812 are described in  $4\frac{1}{2}$  pages. The same space is given to the period from 1775 to 1783 as to the next period from 1783 to 1789. More attention is paid to the campaigns of the Civil War. It is unfortunate that the author did not have more space to describe more fully the struggle between the French and the English for the possession of the continent. The author displays a judicial and impartial spirit in relation to all controverted questions. This is especially noticeable in the consideration of such topics as the administration of Andros in Massachusetts, the persecution of the Quakers at Boston, the effect of the English navigation laws, the character and treatment of the Loyalists and the execution of André. The maps are not numerous but sufficient, while there is a gratifying absence of cheap illustrations. The volume contains many excellent portraits. The period since 1789 is treated by topics. The old arbitrary division by administrations is properly abandoned and is replaced by the following divisions: Federalist Supremacy, 1789-1800; Jeffersonian Republicans, 1801-1812; War and Peace, 1812-1829; the National Democracy, 1829-1844; Slavery in the Territories, 1844-1859; Secession, 1860-1861; The Civil War, 1861-1865; National Development, 1865-1897. A few minor errors have escaped the proof-readers, which should be corrected in the next edition. On page 268 we read that the President in 1829 was elected by a minority vote and on page 396 we learn that Jackson was elected in 1829 by a popular majority of about 140,000. In 1825 Jackson received 99 electoral votes instead of 89, as given on p. 390. The map on p. 116, representing the original grant of Pennsylvania to William Penn, is inaccurately drawn. Gold was discovered in California on January 24, 1848, instead of January 19, as stated in a sentence on p. 453, which is inconsistent with the statement on the same page that it was discovered ten days before the signing of the treaty of peace on February 2. On p. 478 we find "seven out of every ten voters were now slaveholding whites" and on p. 502 "No doubt it is true that only one voter in seven was a slaveholder." James G. Blaine would not usually be spoken of as a "Stalwart," at least he is not so regarded by friends of Roscoe Conkling.

The chief feature of Professor McMaster's work is the excellent descriptions of the social progress of the people. About one-fourth of the volume is devoted to the following chapters: Mechanical and Industrial Progress, Life in the Colonies, The Rising West, Highways of Trade and

Commerce, Growth of the Northwest. The character of these chapters can best be shown by a few quotations. "No man in the country in 1763 had ever seen a stove, or a furnace, or a friction match, or an envelope, or a piece of mineral coal. From the farmer we should have to take the reaper, the drill, the mowing machine, and every kind of improved rake and plow, and give him back the scythe, the cradle, and the flail. From our houses would go the sewing machine, the daily newspaper, gas, running water; and from our tables, the tomato, the cauliflower, the egg-plant, and many varieties of summer fruits. We should have to destroy every railroad, every steamboat, every factory and mill, pull down every line of telegraph, silence every telephone, put out every electric light, and tear up every telegraph cable from the beds of innumerable rivers and seas. We should have to take ether and chloroform from the surgeon, and galvanized iron and India rubber from the arts, and give up every sort of machine moved by steam." "What a strange world Washington would find himself in if he could come back and walk along the streets of the great city which now stands on the banks of the Potomac and bears his name. He sees a great wagon or a white trolley car marked United States Mail, and on inquiry is told that the money now spent by the government each year for the support of the post-offices would have more than paid the national debt when he was President. He hears with amazement that there are now 75,000 post-offices, and recalls that in 1790 there were but seventy-five. He picks up from the sidewalk a piece of paper with a little pink something on the corner. He is told that the portrait on it is his own, that it is a postage stamp, that it costs two cents, and will carry a letter to San Francisco, a city he never heard of, and, if the person to whom it is addressed cannot be found, will bring the letter back to the sender, a distance of over 5000 miles. In his day a letter was a single sheet of paper, no matter how large or small, and the postage on it was determined not by weight, but by distance, and might be anything from six to twenty-five cents."

It is unfortunate that Professor McMaster did not devote his whole volume to such descriptions, which constitute the really valuable part of this work. Aside from these chapters the book differs little from the many other elementary text-books in use in our elementary schools. The political and constitutional history is necessarily very abridged, and many important topics are omitted altogether. For example the only attention which the very numerous and influential body of Loyalists of the Revolution receives is in a foot-note which says "Not all the colonists desired independence. Those who remained loyal to the King were called Tories." In the foot-notes, however, the author has given references to standard works which do much to correct this fault.

The volume contains many excellent features. The maps are good and the illustrations are interesting. The style is clear and concise, and the book is well adapted to the use of elementary classes.

Mr. Montgomery's book is an expansion of his *Leading Facts of American History*. There are 523 pages of text with an appendix which

contains the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, a short list of books on American history, various useful tables and a list of authorities which are referred to in the text by numbers. The tone of the book is moderate and judicial. The style is clear and concise and sometimes interesting. The author treats all phases of our history, with perhaps somewhat less attention to the history of the political parties. Large attention is properly given to the influence of mechanical inventions. The maps are unusually satisfactory, and the copies of old manuscripts and letters add greatly to the interest of the book. The usual arrangement and division of the subject is followed, which is not altogether fortunate, particularly in the periods since 1789. To divide by administrations the history since the adoption of the Constitution cannot but be somewhat arbitrary and misleading. The author has wisely omitted all so-called "suggestive" questions which seldom serve any purpose other than padding. The list of authorities at the close of the volume, although chosen with great care, will we fear be seldom consulted. If the same titles had been given as foot-notes or had been arranged on the margin of each paragraph they would have done much to stimulate further study.

The author has been too generous in the use of bold type. The announcement at the head of each paragraph of all it contains often destroys the interest of the reader. These lines in heavy type occur so frequently that they divert rather than attract attention. Each chapter is closed by a summary which is sometimes useful but often unnecessary and of doubtful value. These frequent summaries and paragraph headings suggest that the book is prepared to enable the student to memorize the text rather than to serve as a guide-book for a more thorough investigation of the various problems of our history. A few errors should be corrected in the text. The original grant to the Virginia Company in 1606 extended only one hundred miles into the interior and not from "sea to sea," as represented by the map on p. 29. The Pope's division of the world is not correctly represented by the map on p. 6, which represents the line established by the treaty of Tordesillas. The line drawn by Pope Alexander was 270 leagues farther east and did not touch the continent of South America. Again, it is difficult to understand from the explanation of the text by what right Virginia could claim the Northwest Territory as no mention is made of the "west by northwest" provision of the charter of 1609. On page 51 James II. is said to have fled from England to France in 1689, which of course should read 1688. There is danger of a misconception arising from the statement on page 220 that in 1789 two of Washington's cabinet were Federalists and two were Antifederalists. The division into political parties had not then arisen. Again it is hardly exact to say, as on page 225, "The Federalists were succeeded by the National Republicans (1828) the Whigs (1834) and by the Republicans (1854) of the present time." Few readers would agree with the author that "slavery was the sole cause of secession."

On the whole the book is a decided improvement on the author's



previous history, and with one exception quite equal to any text-book of American history we have seen. It is well fitted for the use of classes studying the subject for the first time, although not altogether satisfactory for more advanced classes.

Mr. Gordy has provided a readable and satisfactory history for young students. There are abundant references and maps. The book contains almost a superfluous number of illustrations, no less than 235. Some of these are good, some poor and some inexcusably bad. There are frequent summaries in the form of chronological tables. The Dred Scott decision did not permit a slave-owner to carry his slaves into free states, as the author says, but declared that slaves could not be excluded from the territories.

A. A. FREEMAN.

*The History of South Carolina under the Proprietary Government, 1670-1719.* By EDWARD McCRADY, Vice-president of the South Carolina Historical Society. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1897. Pp. ix, 762.)

It has been frequently stated that the small amount of space given to the southern colonies in our text-books on American history has led people to infer that the history of those colonies is devoid of interest. That such is not the fact, however, as far as South Carolina is concerned, is amply proved by the intensely interesting and magnetic volume which has recently come from the pen of Gen. McCrady.

Gen. McCrady has had unusual advantages in the preparation of his book. He is telling the story of his own state. He is personally acquainted with the places he so interestingly describes. He has had access to the manuscript documents scattered throughout the state. That he has improved his opportunities cannot be gainsaid. He has given us a book full of absorbing interest from beginning to end. His style is racy, at times jerky, yet one that kindles enthusiasm by its snap and energy. The character-sketches with which the book abounds are thoroughly entertaining.

There are, however, several faults which mar the general beauty of the work. His adoption of a strictly chronological order of events causes us at times to lose the thread of his narrative. In his enthusiasm he at times permits historical truth to disappear before flights of rhetoric. He too frequently gives abstracts of several similar documents instead of assimilating them and giving a general truth deduced from them. We hardly agree with his statement that the "punishments prescribed for blacks were not, in general, greater than those inflicted upon white men for similar offences" (p. 361). Nor do we believe that South Carolina was regarded "as more nearly allied to the island colonies than to those on the main" (p. 4). We question the accuracy of his statement that in the other colonies, except New York, the emigrants came "in the main directly from the British Islands" (p. 8), for the population of North



Carolina and Pennsylvania was fully as heterogeneous as that of South Carolina. Nor do we think that the reason why son has so noticeably succeeded father in public life was due to the fact that divorces have never been granted in South Carolina (p. 12). The registry system was adopted solely for the purpose of ascertaining from whom quitrents were to be collected (p. 159). Finally, we do not believe that Carolina adopted her social and political system from Barbadoes (p. 8).

But perhaps the most serious general blemish is his controversial tone everywhere present. We feel that he too frequently dwells upon unimportant minor points, and is inclined to be hypercritical. It hardly seems necessary to use a page in an effort to prove that the commonly made statement that lieutenant-governors were seldom appointed on the continent was "altogether a mistake" (p. 34) when twenty-five governors of South Carolina had received their commissions from the home government and five others had held the gubernatorial chair without commission while only three had been commissioned lieutenant-governors. Nor is his list of governors entirely accurate (pp. 719, 720). Yeamans was commissioned governor August 21, 1671, and his commission was sent him December 26, following. We are at a loss to understand what is meant by the statement that he was "proclaimed by the proprietors," April 19, 1672. James Colleton was commissioned August 31, 1686. Craven's first name was Charles, not Edward; the date of his election was November 30, 1710, and of his commission, February 21, 1711. We also doubt the correction that Beaufort was settled twenty years before Georgetown. Beaufort was not settled until the close of the Yemassee War, say 1717, whereas Georgetown was laid out in 1701. Furthermore his statement that the village of Georgetown was never referred to as Winyaw is also wrong. It is frequently so referred to.

This controversial spirit reappears continually. The author's argumentativeness occasionally becomes tiresome, especially when he refers to the proprietors. It is true that the proprietors were inconsistent, arbitrary and often unjust. But so were the settlers, and it hardly seems necessary to occupy two or three pages in criticism of the proprietors every time they are mentioned and yet have no words of censure for the settlers. Gen. McCrady seems to fail to realize the unenviable position of the proprietors, criticised by the crown for a too liberal policy toward the colonists, criticised by the colonists for desiring to line their pockets with gold, and yet endeavoring to place their enterprise upon a sound business basis.

The book is not free from errors. It states that the proprietary governors were required to give bonds in £2000 to £5000 for the faithful execution of the navigation acts and that the objection of the proprietors thereto was overruled (p. 297). While it is true that such governors gave bonds the references which the author gives state that the Board of Trade in addition desired bonds from the proprietors that their appointees would obey the navigation laws. This was what the proprietors objected to as "unnecessary," and furthermore their objection was sustained.

Moreover, this was merely an order from the Board of Trade in 1687, and not a requirement of the statute of 1696 (incorrectly referred to as of 1695). His statement that the German Lutherans "were becoming quite numerous in the colony" by 1704 (p. 404) is incorrect. There were scarcely any Lutherans in the colony at that date. Likewise he states that the first Huguenots arrived in Carolina in 1678 (p. 181), whereas several landed with Governor Sayle in 1670. He states that the patrol system was established in the year 1704 (p. 10). The system lasted, however, only during the continuance of the war with St. Augustine. It was not revived again until 1721, and what he describes is not the system of 1704, but that of 1721. Furthermore the captain of the military company acted as captain of the patrol only between the years 1721 and 1734. After that time the two officers were separate. We doubt his statement that "England claimed America as conquered territory" (p. 51), inasmuch as the Board of Trade as early as 1722 stated that England's title to America was that of discovery and settlement. Again, the charter of Carolina did not establish the Church of England in the colony (p. 67). It merely gave the proprietors "license and power" to establish it should they see fit. West and Morton are each said to have assumed the duties of governor in September, 1685 (pp. 207-210).

His statements in regard to the libraries (pp. 353-354) and the free schools (pp. 487, 510-512) are misleading. Each missionary sent out by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was allowed £10 for books and £5 for pamphlets. Humphreys, the secretary of the society in 1730, tells us that these libraries consisted of "Bibles, Common Prayer Books, Whole Duties of Man, Catechisms and other Devotional Books" written by Episcopal divines and in defence of the English Church. The provincial library at Charleston differed from the other parochial libraries merely in containing a few additional volumes contributed by the proprietors and a few others. The parish libraries were free to all and circulated to a very slight extent. General McCrady gives the impression that only the library at Charleston was free and that it exercised a powerful influence for good over the settlers. The extent of that influence can be understood when we remember that by the middle of the century every book in the Charleston library had disappeared. The school, as well as the library, was established by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel merely for proselyting purposes. The Bible was the main text-book. Every pupil was obliged to learn the catechism and morning and evening prayer by heart and to attend divine worship twice on Sunday and every teacher in the school was a Church of England clergyman. Aside from the missionaries few persons took much interest in the library or the school.—We notice a large number of small errors, some of which are merely typographical.

At the end of the volume is an index occupying thirty-seven pages, remarkably full and apparently carefully prepared. We have examined it only superficially, but have noticed that although it ostensibly contains

a list of the more prominent writers on South Carolina it nevertheless generally omits those whose work is criticised in the body of the book.

The book is devoted mainly to the political history of South Carolina. We are sorry that Gen. McCrady has treated the institutional and social side of her history so briefly. It may be, however, that he intends to devote more space to these subjects in the succeeding volumes, which he intimates may follow, continuing the work to the close of the Revolution. We sincerely hope he may have sufficient encouragement to carry out his plan, for no full history of South Carolina has been written and we feel that at the present time probably no one is better qualified to undertake this task than Gen. McCrady. We hope, however, that he will avoid needless repetition, criticism and controversy.

EDSON L. WHITNEY.

*The Border Wars of New England, commonly called King William's and Queen Anne's Wars.* By SAMUEL ADAMS DRAKE. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1897. Pp. xiii, 305.)

Mr. SAMUEL ADAMS DRAKE has an hereditary right to deal with the pathetic story which for the border settlements of New England darkened with constant gloom and anxiety the period between the accession of William and Mary and the peace of Utrecht. His father, the late Samuel G. Drake, a well-known bookseller and antiquary in Boston, had made this a favorite subject of investigation, and had written or edited several monographs connected with it. From these and other materials gathered by his father, as well as from other sources, Mr. Drake has prepared the volume before us. That it contains little not elsewhere accessible need scarcely be added, but it brings together in a compact and popular form the whole story, comprising in one view what other historians have necessarily treated as episodes. In accordance with a familiar, but not quite accurate designation, he divides his narrative into two parts, the first entitled "King William's War," and the second "Queen Anne's War." The first covers the period from 1689 to 1697, and includes the sacking of Dover, Church's first two expeditions to the eastward, and the Indian attacks on York and Durham. In the second, from 1701 to 1711, we have Church's third expedition, the memorable attacks on Deerfield and Haverhill, and other incidents of minor importance, but all characterized by the brutality which was the inseparable accompaniment of an Indian foray.

In respect to all these events and incidents local pride and pride of ancestry have preserved a great mass of details in letters of the time and in nearly contemporaneous narratives, to say nothing of less trustworthy family traditions. From these it is possible to construct a true and graphic picture of the life of the early settlers who sought to wring from the soil their own subsistence on the outposts of civilization, and to push their farms and villages farther into the wilderness. This Mr. Drake has done successfully, and in his pages the reader will find a clear and sufficiently minute ac-

count of the two phases of the struggle for supremacy on the northern Atlantic coast, first the futile effort of the semi-barbarous tribes of Indians to force back the advancing tide of civilization which was pushing up the river valleys, and secondly the not less persistent efforts of the French in Canada to establish their own rule here and to drive out the English colonists—efforts operating in large measure through the labors and sacrifices of the semi-political missionaries of the Catholic Church. The border wars of New England were the result of this irrepressible conflict, which could terminate only with the complete and final triumph of one or the other party to the struggle. It was only when Quebec fell that the English settlers could breathe freely, and had no longer to fear either Indians or French. The early Indian fighters received a hard education, but the lessons which they learned were deeply impressed on that generation, and were not lost on their descendants who from time to time encountered like perils.

When considered merely as incidents of border warfare, where a comparatively small body of half-naked savages rushed at midnight, or in the early dawn, on insignificant hamlets and butchered the inhabitants or dragged them into captivity, in which some of the younger captives lost all regard for their own religion and all fondness for civilized life, the attacks on York, Durham, Deerfield, Haverhill and the less conspicuous incidents of the same kind have little historical significance, and might well be suffered to fade into oblivion. But when viewed under that larger aspect to which we have referred, as parts of the story of a long-continued struggle between semi-barbarism and civilization for the possession of a vast region then thinly peopled, but destined to become the seat of a great empire or to remain in a state of nature, and between two great nationalities transferring to a new world the rivalries of European policy, the story becomes of an importance which cannot be overlooked or neglected. The more closely it is studied, and the more thoroughly we understand the character and purposes of the combatants on the one side and the other, the better we shall appreciate the courage and endurance by which our heritage was won and the persistence of the savages, already weakened by pestilence and intertribal warfare, in seeking to destroy the border settlements whose existence was silently and steadily making their old life impossible. It is because Mr. Drake's small and unpretentious volume deals faithfully with this single chapter of our history, and in a way to make it attractive to the average reader, that we cordially welcome its publication.

Of the numerous illustrations something perhaps ought to be added, and we will frankly say that the loss would have been small if they had all been omitted. The wood-cuts of William III., Queen Mary, Queen Anne, Cotton Mather, Sir Edmund Andros, Judge Sewall, and others add nothing to the interest or value of the book. The portrait of Colonel Benjamin Church is a reproduction of the fictitious engraving, slightly altered from a well-known portrait of the English poet Charles Churchill, which was first published in the second edition of Church's *History of*

*Philip's War*, and the fraudulent character of which was exposed many years ago by the late Charles Deane.<sup>1</sup> The original of the portrait labelled Lord Bellomont has not been identified, we believe; but its authenticity is more than doubtful, and whoever sat for it he was probably not an English nobleman. The earliest copy of it which we have seen is a heliotype prefixed to Mr. De Peyster's *Address* on the Earl of Bellomont, and it was afterward engraved for the *Memorial History of Boston*, but it bears little or no resemblance to a contemporary engraving of the Earl now in the library of Harvard University.<sup>2</sup> Some of the engravings of houses are interesting, but not of much importance; and the same remark will apply to the maps. The fancy sketches, such as Phips raising the sunken treasure, and Hannah Dustan slaying her captors, are worthless.

CHARLES C. SMITH.

*The Story of the Palatines.* An Episode in Colonial History. By SANFORD H. COBB. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1897. Pp. vii, 319.)

THE story of the Palatines received simultaneous treatment in America during the year 1897, by Mr. Cobb in the book above mentioned, and by Mr. F. R. Diffenderfer in his work entitled, *The German Exodus to England in 1709*.<sup>3</sup> While the latter work confines itself to the history of the Palatines (so-called) of the great migration (*Massenauswanderung der Pfälzer*)<sup>4</sup> to England in the year 1709, the book of Mr. Cobb follows these exiled Germans across the Atlantic to their new homes in America, tracing the steps of each successive company of these Palatines in their attempts to settle in the British dominions—the first company sent to Ireland and settled in Munster (1709); the second, shipped to Carolina under the direction of Christopher de Graffenried and Lewis Michell (1709); and the third, consisting of two detachments, one under the guidance of Kocherthal arriving in New York in the winter of 1708–9 and settling at the present Newburgh, the other larger detachment arriving in June of 1710.

Governor Hunter's disastrous experiment of tar-making from the New York pines, with the aid of the unskilled Palatines, the ultimate bolt of these Palatines for their "Promised Land," "Scorie" (Schoharie), their subsequent migration to the valley of the Mohawk and final dispersion, resulting in the withdrawal of a large number to the Tulpehocken region of Pennsylvania in 1723, are the subject of four graphic chapters entitled respectively "The Experiment," "The Failure," "The Promised Land," and "The Dispersion." The Biblical metaphor is well sustained, as they were at the beginning under the leadership of their "Joshua" Kocherthal.

<sup>1</sup> See *Proceedings of Mass. Hist. Soc.*, XIX. 243–245.

<sup>2</sup> See *Narrative and Critical History of America*, V. 97.

<sup>3</sup> Issued in the *Publications* of the Pennsylvania German Society, 1897, and also as a separate reprint, Lancaster, 1897.

<sup>4</sup> From Friedrich Kapp's *Geschichte der Deutschen im Staate New York*.

The author accompanies his book with maps of the Palatine settlements in New York and Pennsylvania, and gives at the close of the book a list of family names traceable to the Palatines of New York. The story is told in an interesting style and with much devotion to the theme, which recalls many reminiscences of the Palatines, the author's old parishioners.

In the introduction the author assigns three chief reasons for writing a book on this episode in colonial history: (1) "that it has never been written in its fulness, or with proper regard to its historical importance, (2) that much of the little which has been written about it abounds in misunderstandings and misstatements, (3) that the story, truly told, is one of such intrinsic interest and bears such relation to colonial history as to make it worthy of regard by every student of American society and institutions." This would lead us to expect an original study of this chapter of colonial history. But, glancing at the list of sources given in Note III., p. 311, one is struck with the absence of all German titles relating to the subject. Löher's *Geschichte und Zustände der Deutschen in Amerika*, Kapp's *Geschichte der Deutschen im Staate New York*, and Eickhoff's *In der neuen Heimath* are all passed over in silence. The only solitary reference to *Hallische Nachrichten* is quoted from Rupp's *Berks County*. So far has the author depended on English sources that he constructs his chapter on the history of the Palatinate with apparently no reference to the old standard work, Häusser's *Geschichte der Pfalz*, and in utter ignorance of the more recent master-work on the Palatines, *Die Pfälzer* by Riehl. After these omissions one could not expect any mention of such details as *Ausführlich und umständlicher Bericht von der Berühmten Landschafft Carolina, in dem Engelländischen America gelegen, Von Kocherthalem*,<sup>1</sup> Zweiter Druck, Frankfurt am Mayn, 1700; or *Das Verlangte, nicht Erlangte Canaan, oder Beschreibung von der Reise nach Carolina und Pennsylvanien dem Kocherthalen Bericht entgegengesetzt* [By M. W. Hoën], Frankfurt und Leipzig, 1711, not to mention other later works. Seventy years ago the father of American history gave the precept, learned from the Germans, and set the example of writing American history with a full command of the original sources. It seems high time that American readers and American writers of history should make it their business to command the German sources or cease to present as original what is a mere compilation from English and other secondary sources. In the case of the Palatines much important work has been made accessible in English by Brodhead, O'Callaghan, and others, but this does not exempt the later writers from examining the older sources.

Mr. Cobb's book fulfills our expectations only as a sympathetic presentation of the *story* of the Palatines, and will do much to arouse popular interest in the subject. The treatment of the early stage of the migration to England is superseded by the work of Mr. Diffenderffer, who has reprinted the extracts from the Journals of the Proceedings of Her Majesty's Commissioners for Trade and Plantations and other documents relating to the subject. The *history* of the Palatines, however, written from

<sup>1</sup> Note that the name is *Kocherthal*, not *Kockerthal* as Cobb writes it.



the original sources and covering the entire migration, is yet to be written.

M. D. LEARNED.

*The Battle of Harlem Heights*, September 16, 1776, with a Review of the Events of the Campaign. By HENRY P. JOHNSTON, A.M., Professor of History, College of the City of New York. (New York: Columbia Press, Macmillan Co. 1897. Pp. ix, 234.)

IN connection with the memorial celebration of the battle of Harlem Heights last fall, on the site of the battle, the present grounds of Columbia University, Professor Johnston has published the above careful and scholarly account of the campaign which led up to that skirmish, and of the results of the latter upon the succeeding movements of the British and American armies. This task could not have fallen to a more competent writer. The author had already contributed largely to our knowledge of the campaign of 1776 about New York and Brooklyn,<sup>1</sup> and had at his disposal the co-operation of the officials of the New York Historical Society as well as that society's valuable collection of Revolutionary documents.

By a comparison of all the available original material, which is printed in full, and occupies just half the volume, Professor Johnston establishes once for all the exact site of the three successive skirmishes which constituted the battle of Harlem Heights, namely, on the present line of the Boulevard and of about 128th, 120th and 108th Streets. Earlier authorities had placed the battle some distance to the east, while Mr. E. C. Benedict had, in 1878, placed it a mile or more to the north of its true location. Mrs. Martha J. Lamb accepted his interpretation, and, in consequence, the error was perpetuated by a tablet commemorative of the battle placed by a patriotic society on the wall of Trinity Cemetery near 153d Street, and which is still there.

Beside establishing the site of the battle-field beyond all possibility of doubt, the author shows clearly how the battle of Harlem, though of slight importance considered as a successful engagement of the American with the British outposts, was in reality of great importance in "stimulating the drooping spirits of the American soldier" and "in effectually disturbing the plans of the enemy."

After evacuating Boston in March and recuperating some months at Halifax, General Howe appeared with his fleet in New York harbor toward the end of June, 1776. Debarking his army on Staten Island, he crossed the Narrows in August, and brought on the battle of Long Island. Unable to follow up his success at once, because of the skillful withdrawal of the Americans to Manhattan Island, Howe crossed the East River and took possession of the city of New York on September 15, Washington repeating his tactics and withdrawing to the northern end of the island. On the following day the battle of Harlem Heights was fought, the Amer-

<sup>1</sup> H. P. Johnston, *The Campaign of 1776 about New York and Brooklyn*, Memoirs of the Long Island Historical Society, Vol. III., Brooklyn, 1878.



ican outposts on the slope to the north of the "Hollow Way," now Manhattan Street, boldly advancing and driving back the British outposts on the heights south of that depression till their further advance was checked by the British reinforcements which hurried to the scene of action. The Americans then retired to the main body of their army. The real importance of this successful skirmish lies in the fact that it evidently raised General Howe's estimate of the fighting powers of the American army, and led him to avoid attacking it in a pitched battle on the northern end of Manhattan Island. He preferred to outflank Washington by moving the larger part of his army up the Sound and landing it near New Rochelle, thereby compelling Washington to withdraw most of his army from Manhattan Island, and to move inland toward White Plains, where the two armies met in battle on October 28.

The effect of the victory at Harlem upon the American leaders explains their plans for the subsequent campaign. It raised their hopes of successfully resisting the royal troops, and largely influenced Washington to leave a garrison of 2,500 men in Fort Washington and the neighboring redoubts, while he retired northward with the main army to White Plains. The easy capture of Fort Washington by the British about a month later showed how seriously Washington had overestimated its strength and underestimated the aggressive power of Howe's army. In a word, the battle of Harlem, with the movements before and after, illustrates well the general success and the one distinct failure of Washington's generalship, the former in avoiding being crushed by an enemy who outnumbered him and skillfully withdrawing his army to more inaccessible points; the latter by allowing himself to be persuaded to separate his army and leave a considerable body to certain capture at Fort Washington, the loss of whom, at that time, was a most serious injury to the American cause.

J. C. SCHWAB.

*The Westward Movement.* The Colonies and the Republic West of the Alleghanies, 1763-1798. With full cartographical Illustrations from contemporary Sources. By JUSTIN WINSOR. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1897. Pp. viii, 595.)

THIS, the last contribution of Justin Winsor to history, is monumental in its erudition and is a work of the highest importance to students of the beginnings of the West. In a volume of nearly six hundred pages, every page resembling a frontiersman in its sinewy freedom from anything like superfluous flesh, the author has traced the westward advance from the close of the French and Indian war in 1763 to the last years of the eighteenth century. It is unnecessary to point out that these were years full of events in western history. They include the development of the policy of Great Britain in respect to the West, after the expulsion of France; the exploration and settlement of Kentucky and Tennessee;

Lord Dunmore's war and the Revolutionary war beyond the mountains, including the memorable conquest of the Northwest by George Rogers Clark; the intrigues of France and Spain to restrict us at the peace to the Alleghany and Ohio boundaries; the British policy in the retention of the western posts and in respect to the Indians; the Ordinance of 1787 and the settlement of Ohio, with the accompanying Indian struggles; the efforts of Spain to hold the Southwest and to exclude the frontiersmen from the navigation of the Mississippi; her attempts to seduce the frontier leaders from their American allegiance; the attempts at independent states in Kentucky and eastern Tennessee; the efforts of Genet to use the Kentucky backwoodsmen in an attempt to seize Louisiana for France; the securing of the Northwest by Jay's treaty and Wayne's victories, and the acquisition of freedom of the Mississippi by Pinckney's treaty. On all these topics Mr. Winsor is full of information.

Every one of these subjects bristles with historical difficulties. They have been studied by special students in extended works; but it is safe to say that never before has the whole field been surveyed with more minute care. Mr. Roosevelt has covered substantially the period in nearly four volumes, or about eleven hundred pages. The aims of the two writers and their ideals are, however, in clear contrast. Mr. Roosevelt is mainly interested in the manners, customs and institutions of the frontiersmen, and in the campaigns of their great leaders. He gives a flowing and picturesque narrative of the movements of the backwoodsmen, with generalizations on the relations of these movements to world-history. He makes a large use of the manuscript material for his subject in American collections, and he is little concerned with the events in Congress and in the back country of the Middle States. Mr. Winsor was, on the other hand, first of all the librarian, keenly and critically searching the printed works for separate items of historical information in the whole field. For example, his treatment of the Revolution in the West, in contrast with that of Mr. Roosevelt, shows the wider range of Mr. Winsor's treatment of the subject. He loved an abundance of facts, and he knew the uses of the card catalogue. He lacked the artistic instinct, he was wanting in that historical imagination which fuses the separate elements of historical knowledge into a single and pleasing presentation; his classified cards are always in sight. The result is that Mr. Winsor's work is a thesaurus of events for the student, rather than a history for the general reader. His work is essentially monographic, and yet by a most regrettable policy, Mr. Winsor, librarian though he was, has omitted, except in the rarest cases, to cite the authorities for his statements. It is true that where every page teems with historical facts, drawn from a wide variety of sources, such citation would be particularly cumbrous; and yet, by omitting them, he deprives those readers, whose needs the work is best fitted to serve, of the means of using his material, of testing his statements, and of reaching satisfactory conclusions regarding the relative contributions of the author himself.

In a work of this nature there is little to be said of the general historical conclusions of the author; the criticism must relate rather to the

correctness of his specific statements. At the same time, it must be said that the grouping furnished by the separate chapter-headings reveals a system and a sweep of view that show that Mr. Winsor might, with a different policy, have elaborated his conception of the westward advance into a philosophy of the movement. He prefers to allow his classified events to tell their own story; and it is important to note that it is events rather than institutions or ideals that he considers.

The work gives some indications that the author's final revision, of style particularly, was not as complete as he no doubt would have wished to make it. In illustration, it may be pointed out that his sentences sometimes say the opposite thing from that which he intended. In writing of the "growing influence of the anti-Quaker element in the province" of Pennsylvania, he says, "It was to this latter conservative and sluggish faction that the Germans mainly adhered" (page 12). Speaking of slavery he says (page 289), "Jefferson's preliminary ordinance of 1784 had rooted it out of every part of the trans-Alleghany region, though this section had received only the vote of six states when seven were required." It is misleading to use the words "preliminary ordinance" of Jefferson's draft (which, by the way, was not to go into effect until 1800), and although the careful reader will see that the intention is to say that the draft was changed, yet the words do not convey that meaning. Other examples of loose expression are the following: "Jay, who had been chosen minister to Spain (October 4), to enforce its claim to the Mississippi." On page 201, the careless use of the pronoun "they" gives the impression that a large party was ready to yield western New York, and in general the region beyond the Alleghanies, on the demand of France and Spain, at the close of the Revolution. Fortunately he cites here his authority, a proposition of Gouverneur Morris, who was well known as an opponent to western ideas.

At times, Mr. Winsor seems to attribute to the pioneers motives, based upon events in the East, for which there is not sufficient evidence. His work in connecting the eastern and western influences upon particular events is valuable, but it is overdoing the matter to say (p. 7), "The immediate struggle over the Stamp Act, which was closed by its repeal in 1766, produced, for a time at least, that political quiet which induces enterprise. The attention of the pioneers was again drawn to the western movement." A writer more familiar with the spirit of the backwoodsman would not have made that statement. Nor is it easy to see how Mr. Winsor, after the attention which he has given to the influence of the fur-trader in Canadian policy, could regard the extension of the boundaries of Quebec by the well known act as directed by an ulterior aim, to which the needs of the fur-trade served merely as a cloak. The Canadian archives as studied by Professor Coffin, in his monograph on *The Quebec Act and the American Revolution*, show how important the Indian trade was considered by the British officials in their correspondence on this topic. One of the most curious illustrations of the author's apparent lack of understanding of the fur-trade occurs in his discussion of the

boundaries provided by the treaty of 1783. He describes the boundary on the northwest as in part the Grand Portage (pp. 220, 239), when in fact, it was precisely because the Grand Portage was, by a British misconception, no doubt, left wholly within the limits of the United States, that the Canadian traders were so discontented with the limits. Perhaps this, as much as any single element, sharpened the traders' appeals to the home government which were so influential in inducing Great Britain to retain the western posts. For a cartographer of Mr. Winsor's ability, this is a remarkable misunderstanding. Similar slips may be instanced in his treatment of the projects for cutting the West into new states. He confuses at times the petitions of the people of West Virginia proper, with the petitions from Kentucky and from the State of Franklin (pp. 245, 341). In his account of the Ordinance of 1784 he attributes to Jefferson the intention to make fourteen states in the West, adding territory south of the 35th parallel and east of the falls of the Ohio to South Carolina and Georgia (page 258). But the evidence for this probably rests on the letter of Congressman David Howell, not cited, and Howell gives his own interpretation. It is not unlikely that Jefferson favored this adjustment of boundaries, but his plan does not warrant Mr. Winsor's statement. It is possible that Mr. Winsor relies on the contemporaneous map given opposite the page of the text cited, which he describes as showing "the proposed divisions of the western territory under Jefferson's ordinance of 1784, with the caution that "Franklin is misplaced." But not only is Franklin misplaced, the boundary meridians are completely wrong, and the map is as deceptive as could well be. If any errors in it were to be pointed out, these should also have been.

The Ordinance of 1787 receives considerable attention in the volume. Mr. Winsor is not impressed with its effect upon the destiny of the Northwest; he finds the real exclusion of slavery from that region rather due to "the constancy of a later generation" than to "an ordinance which was never in its entire provisions effective, which had been annulled by the adoption of the Constitution and substantially re-enacted by the first Congress." But in compensation for this attitude he attributes to the Ordinance an important effect upon the Constitutional Convention. As the view appears to be original, it is well to present it in Mr. Winsor's words:

"The federal convention, just at this time sitting in Philadelphia, was seeking to find a way out of a dismal political environment. It needed, in one aspect, the encouragement of just the outcome which a copy of the perfected ordinance, as printed in a Philadelphia newspaper on July 25, afforded. The bold assumption of Congress to regulate the public domain was a stroke which helped the convention better to understand the relations of the states to the unorganized territory in the West. The enlarged condition which the new ordinance gave to the future problem of western power, and its effect on the original states, clarified the perplexities which had excited in the convention the apprehensions of Gerry and others. The influence which the new outlook had upon the different members was naturally in accordance with their individual habits of mind."

Then follow quotations from the speeches of Morris and Mason with regard to the rights and privileges of western states, and the inference is that the advocates of western rights derived their strength in some degree from the provisions of the Ordinance. But Mr. Winsor here overlooks the fact which he had already shown, that the essential principles of the federal territorial system had been early stated, and that they had been formulated in a way even more conservative of the power of western states in the ordinance of 1784. Moreover, the most critical debate in the Convention over the new western states was that in which the question of the congressional representation of new states as compared with the original states was agitated. In that debate the views of Mason and of Morris were clearly presented as early as July 5, and again on July 11. The publication of the ordinance noted by Mr. Winsor on the 25th of the same month could therefore have had no influence on the attitude of these speakers, and the votes on July 5 and July 14 showed that the Convention was not disposed to deprive the western people of their equal rights. It will be remembered that the ordinance was not reported in Congress, sitting in New York, until July 11, and that it was adopted July 13. The journey between these cities at that time took about two days, so that it is improbable that the ordinance had any effect on the vote of the Convention on representation, even if it were sent as soon as reported, instead of being made known by the publication above mentioned. The vote in the Convention following the speech of Mason quoted by the author was one on August 29, by which a clause providing that "new states shall be admitted on the same terms with the original states" was stricken out. So if the ordinance had an effect on the Convention, it would seem to have been opposite to the interests of the West.

When an author has covered so wide a range with such minuteness as has Mr. Winsor, it will perhaps seem improper to object that he has made little or no use, so far as the book gives evidence, of manuscript material in the archives particularly of France and Spain, upon important diplomatic relations between those countries and the United States in respect to the West. Mr. Winsor shows the dangers of this neglect, however, in his treatment of such an important subject as the effort of the French government to secure Louisiana and the Floridas in the period of Genet's mission. As the recent reports of the American Historical Manuscripts Commission show, there is an abundance of material to explain the aims and the detailed plans of the French and the Spaniards in the archives of those countries; but Mr. Winsor contents himself with using a few of the secondary authorities, and he quotes, with evident regret at its meagre information, the journal of Michaux, which furnishes hardly more than an itinerary, valuable chiefly in its relation to the French archives and to the Draper collection of George Rogers Clark papers. It is hard to understand why such a student as Mr. Winsor should content himself with a regret over the paucity of information on such a subject when the whole wealth of these archives was open to him,

and it is a striking illustration of the strange neglect of archives by the recent American historians.

Space makes it impossible to speak of the contributions of the author to the many other topics that lie within the compass of the work. There is no one of them on which he has not added information, diligently sought in many books of printed collections. His information is comprehensive and exact, as a rule, and if the present reviewer has rather pointed out minor defects than dwelt upon the great merit of the book as a whole, it is because it is difficult to praise such a work in other than general terms. When all minor criticisms on detail have been made—and in a work so abounding in statements of fact it is remarkable how few such criticisms must be—the book remains a splendid proof of the immense research of its author, of his skill and fairness in dealing with a multiplicity of detail, and of the continental breadth of his view. To have edited the *Narrative and Critical History of America*, and to have followed that by the series that begins with Columbus and ends with the *Westward Movement*, is to have established his ability in so wide a range of fields, requiring such stores of knowledge, and such a diversity of historical equipment that Winsor cannot but be granted a position among the first of American historians.

FREDERICK J. TURNER.

*Contemporary American Opinion of the French Revolution.* By CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN, Ph.D., Professor of History, Smith College. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Extra Vol. XVI.] (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1897. Pp. x, 315.)

MR. HAZEN's book is naturally a compilation, but it is a successful one. He judiciously divides his subject into two parts: I. The Opinions of Americans Abroad; II. The Opinions of Americans at Home. In the first, he presents the views of Thomas Jefferson, Gouverneur Morris, and James Monroe, who were successively our representatives in France. Of these three chapters, those on Jefferson and Morris are the most important, for Monroe did not reach France until after the Thermidor, and, moreover, the nature of his tenets disqualified him for the rôle of a dispassionate critic.

Mr. Hazen has ably depicted Jefferson's attitude toward the French Revolution, and has shown the historical inutility of his much-quoted *Autobiography* by comparing it with his letters. The memoranda given of Jefferson's tour through France in 1787 are instructive. Until recent years, our knowledge of pre-revolutionary rural France has been derived largely from the *Travels* of that observing agriculturist, Arthur Young. Jefferson, however, throws a little light upon a subject lately illumined by Champion in his *La France d'après les Cahiers de 1789*. The picture given by the American minister is by no means joyous, but it is far from terrible. In 1789, Jefferson sailed for home, believing that the French Revolution was practically over.



Morris, who arrived in the same year, found events moving too rapidly. His conservatism forced him into a strange rôle—the minister of the Great Republic, he preached incessantly moderation; for he perceived that Frenchmen, in their political childhood, could not safely march to liberty *au pas de charge*. Mr. Hazen corrects Taine, who gives to Morris's expression, "Autorité is a name, not a real existence," the date of July 19, 1789, in a letter to Washington. The author proves it to have been written on July 1st in a letter to Jay. The latter date would show political acumen on the part of Morris, for on July 1st the Bastille still stood, and "Broglie the War-God" was fulminating on the Champ de Mars.

It is well known that the American Revolution was potent in beginning the revolution in France, but, perhaps, not so generally recognized that the French Revolution, once begun, was, in its turn, dominant in America. This Mr. Hazen has forcibly shown in the second part of his book. The first trumpetings of liberty in France sounded across the sea, and a nation, newly-emancipated and grateful for past aid, ramped in response. The tricolored triumph of Genet fanned the popular flame; the Marseillaise thundered in the streets of Philadelphia; literature and the drama caught the echo, and the politicians fought in our capital the battles of the Jacobins and Girondins. Naturally with the growth of atheism in France and the enormities of the Terror an American reaction set in. All this the author has portrayed in a scholarly manner, adding a valuable bibliography.

Mr. Hazen's research is thorough, his interpretation lucid. His work has a distinct value both for the student of the French Revolution and for his fellow-worker in the contemporary American period.

JAMES EUGENE FARMER.

*Nullification and Secession in the United States.* A History of the Six Attempts during the First Century of the Republic. By EDWARD PAYSON POWELL. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1897. Pp. xi, 461.)

THIS book purports to be a history of six attempts at nullification and secession in the United States. It consists of eight rambling chapters, each of which is followed by an appendix containing documents apparently selected at random. The first chapter deals with the formation of the Union, and the last with the danger to the permanency of the republic. The six intermediate chapters discuss what the author regards as the six overt acts of disunion, viz., the nullification resolutions of 1798, the plot for a Northern confederacy in 1803-4, Burr's attempt at cleaving the Union in the Southwest, New England nullification in 1812-14, South Carolina nullification in 1832, secession in 1861.

The author states that his work was written for a purpose. It was his desire to state facts as viewed from a strictly national point of view, and to aid thereby in creating a more generous national sentiment and a

conviction that political righteousness has not been the exclusive property of any one part of the United States. His principles and conclusions are all the most loyal supporter of the Southern view of the Union could wish. He belittles the Federalists and their achievements, classes Hamilton with Burr, extols Jefferson, justifies the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions, and smooths over the nullification and secession movements. He upholds the compact theory of the Constitution, denying that the Supreme Court is the final arbiter, and accepts and extends the historical theory of the Constitution advanced by Mr. Lodge and supported by Professors Channing and Woodrow Wilson. His views are perhaps sufficiently indicated in the summary of his discussion of secession. The final attempt at secession was "the result of the drawing of a geographical line, on opposite sides of which the attempt was made to sustain diverse and conflicting forms of labor. There grew up institutions and customs, theories, and sentiments so entirely opposite that opposition must express itself with constantly increasing bitterness. Separation had been suggested on either side with about equal frequency; nullification of Congressional acts had been undertaken on both sides; nor had the Supreme Court been held by either the North or the South as final arbiter. State rights had been affirmed by Northern as well as by Southern states, and there was no difference as to the principles of state integrity and state sovereignty. The North would have separated from the South had not the South undertaken to secede from the North" (p. 366).

Mr. Powell has not made a substantial contribution to our literature dealing with the nature of the Union. He has said nothing new that will stand criticism, and has not given an especially forcible presentation of views familiar to students. It astonishes one to find that he dignifies Burr's conspiracy as an attempt at secession and that he makes so much of the plot of a few irresponsible disgruntled New England politicians in 1803-4. Part of Chapter I. and its appendix, and all of Chapters III. and IV. with their appendices should have been omitted. The book as a whole is unscientific, unbalanced, illogical and partial. The weak criticism (p. 375) of Dr. von Holst's proposition that the states by accepting the Constitution fused themselves thereby and at once into a nation; the contention (p. 67) that Virginia distinctly reserved the right to withdraw from the Union; and the statements that it was the Mrs. Eaton episode which hurled Calhoun back on South Carolina and sectionalism (p. 283) and that the deep cause of South Carolina's action in two rebellions was state character (p. 285), are typical. The work cannot be regarded as a history at all; it is rather a series of crude essays. It will scarcely interest the general reader and cannot be of value to specialists.

DAVID F. HOUSTON.

*The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, Comprising his Letters, Private and Official, his Public Documents, and his Speeches. Edited by his Grandson, CHARLES R. KING, M.D., LL.D. Vol. IV., 1801-1806. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1897. Pp. xxi, 599.)

THE fourth volume of the present work is full of valuable material and confirms an earlier impression that this collection is one of the most important select contributions yet made to the materials for the writing of American history. For some reason King seems to have drawn from his correspondents a peculiar quality of frankness, for no series of letters which have passed under our eyes contain such outspoken views on whatever they touch upon. The most curious tone observable throughout is that already commented upon in the review of the third volume. Throughout the work there is a note on the part of the Federalists of pessimism towards the future of democracy, and towards the capacity of the people for self-government, that is truly astonishing when it is borne in mind that at the moment when these letters were written the United States was almost the only country in the world at peace; that her people were growing rich by agriculture and commerce, that her national debt was being paid and her treasury overflowing. Thus the best that Ames can suggest is that "despair should not be confessed—still less circulated;" and he adds, "we are now in the Roland and Condorcet act of our Comedy. Whether we go on to Danton and Robespierre acts depends on time and accident." King himself asserts that he will not "despair of the public welfare, provided the judiciary is maintained." Hamilton "is in utter despair of the system!" and looks forward to "a serious commotion, and that at no very remote period!" adding elsewhere, "the prospects of our country are not brilliant." Sedgwick in explanation of his retirement says that he should "never have abandoned the government but from the most complete conviction that the people would make an experiment of democracy." Troup thinks he has said enough when he remarks, "things are according to the natural destiny of the government, and I see no reason to suppose that they will alter." And Jay writes that the present times teach us "the capital vanity of expecting that, from the Perfectability of human nature and the Lights of Philosophy, the Multitude will become virtuous and wise, or their Demagogues candid and honest." The dread of democracy is the recurrent note endlessly dwelt upon. "The aristocracy of virtue is destroyed; personal influence is at an end," groans Sedgwick. "Our system is just where it is by nature destined to be—in the hands of demagogues," is Troup's version of the same complaint. "The mass is far from sound," Hamilton asserts, and Gore predicts "deep misfortune" for "the rude and uncultivated minds of those who will soon have such a preponderating influence in our Federal politics." It is amusing to note the Federalist bewilderment over this condition, and over their own helplessness. The superiority "of the Federal Character, in Congress and the

Newspaper," is maintained by Cabot ; and again he recurs to this when he writes "there has never been a period when the Federal Cause was maintained with more good sense and dignity." None the less, Hamilton writes that "I as yet discover no satisfactory symptoms of the revolution of opinion in the *mass* ;" while John Quincy Adams goes so far as to say "the power of the administration rests upon a support of a much stronger majority of the people throughout the Union than the former administrations have possessed, since the first establishment of the Constitution," and of the Federal system he writes, "the experiment, such as it was, has failed ; and to attempt its restoration would be as absurd as to undertake the resurrection of a carcass seven years in its grave." The remedy for this unendurable peace and prosperity Ames finds in outside danger, and claims that "we need, as all nations do, the compression on the outside of our circle of the formidable neighbour—whose presence shall at all times excite stronger fears than demagogues can inspire the people with towards their government." Yet, bad as things seem to the Federalists, and puzzled as they are to imagine why the small intellectual classes should have been retired from power, they none the less recognize an occasional merit in the system ; as Troup, when he finds "a great source of consolation" to be that "the republican system" does "respect the rights of property ;" and Jay, though he considers that "if these are not upside down Times, they are certainly up and down Times," yet adds a side compliment to democracy and the masses when he writes that "Athens, the city of philosophy, and Rome, the city of everything, saw and felt much worse."

Turning from this curious psychological study of intellectual pessimism which constitutes the chief flavor of the work, there is much that is interesting. At the very time that the American officials, yclept demagogues, to whom the people had confided the government, were borrowing money on which to live during their term of office, and retiring from those offices poor men, and in some cases bankrupts, we find a picture of European stock-jobbing through international politics, in which the very greatest of the ministers were concerned, and out of which Talleyrand is said to have himself made two hundred thousand pounds in one transaction. Of King's negotiations in England, though probably no American minister has stood in such friendly relations with any particular government (except Franklin at the French court) he himself is forced to state that "they are often discouraging and sometimes disgusting ;" and when Monroe succeeded him the condition became even worse, the new minister taking pains to keep himself ignorant of all European conditions, and carefully avoiding official circles in England. This conduct, combined with the discomfort and mistreatment endured by Merry in America, were enough in themselves to create ill feeling between the two governments, and only serve again to show how important the personal relations of diplomatic agents come to be. In connection with Louisiana we find King asserting that the United States is "the first power in our own hemisphere." On impressment there is much, the most impor-

tant being King's conference with Lord St. Vincent, in which the astonishing statement is made by the former that the whole of British impressments at the time the conference was held (May 13, 1803) were not more than enough to "man a single ship." There is more that is interesting on the attempted slave colonization which grew out of the Virginia insurrection of 1801, and considerable in relation to the fast-and-loose conduct of Aaron Burr towards Federalists, Hamilton going so far as to say that "our friends in Congress" were "polluting themselves with the support of the second personage for the Presidency." Gore writes that the English government are particularly nervous over Fulton's diving machines and torpedoes, as well as over the rumor that he was constructing and using a boat that was designed "to work against the stream." Anent the press of the day we have the wail of Livingston, who complains that he is being called "a fool, a lunatic, a minion, and a great many other things equally well calculated to cure me of vanity, and to raise the reputation of the country which has for upwards of thirty years successively employed me in high and confidential offices."

As in the former volumes, the editorial labor is commendably done, and we note but one typographical error, aside from that corrected by an insert, the use of the name Warmely, at page 43, for Wormely.

PAUL LEICESTER FORD.

*The Life of Charles Jared Ingersoll.* By his Grandson, WILLIAM M. MEIGS. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 1897. Pp. 351.)

THE subject of this admirable little biography was a remarkable man—an intense American, a true believer in the capacity of the people to rule themselves, an active participant in public affairs upon occasions between 1812 and 1849; an historian as well as a statesman, an orator as well as a lawyer; a man of marked eccentricities, but of bold and original views. His career is of general as well as special interest, for he was full of fire and aggressive force, and contributed in no small degree to the development of our national self-assertion and self-reliance at critical periods. At times impulsive and indiscreet, he was always salient and fearless. His talents were of a high order, and his exertions never failed to command attention.

Although it is more than thirty years since his death, and therefore all personal recollection of him has been largely lost, yet the perpetuation of his memory is a worthy object, and the author has accomplished with skill and judgment the difficult task of reviving interest in his career. The book displays research, care in statement, good temper, impartiality, and an agreeable style. It will attract even those unacquainted with Mr. Ingersoll's name. It is an interesting contribution to our biographical literature. It enlarges, too, the general knowledge of the part played by Pennsylvania in Congress in sustaining the War Party in 1812, and traces with some minuteness the growth of an American spirit in letters, as well as politics.

Charles Jared Ingersoll was of respectable English ancestry transplanted to Massachusetts, and later to Connecticut. His grandfather was a graduate of Yale, and became a distinguished lawyer. In 1759 he was sent to England as agent for the colony of Connecticut, and to his report we owe the preservation of Barré's brilliant oratory in reply to Townshend—so dear to the school-boys of America. Some years later he lost his popularity by acting as stamp collector, and narrowly escaped violence at the hands of a mob at Wethersfield.

Jared Ingersoll, the younger, the father of the subject of the book, was also a distinguished lawyer, bred in the Middle Temple, and later one of the leaders of the old bar of Philadelphia, a framer of the Constitution of the United States, a candidate for the vice-presidency on the Federal ticket in 1812, and at his death a judge in Philadelphia. Here, in 1782, Charles Jared Ingersoll was born; his mother, Elizabeth Pettit, being the daughter of a Continental congressman.

Young Ingersoll was soon introduced to distinguished company, and met many of the leading men of the day. While quick in learning, he lacked application, and left Princeton owing to some dispute with the authorities, but not involving collegiate censure. He travelled somewhat in his own country, wrote a tragedy, contributed a poem to the *Portfolio*, and was admitted to the bar while not twenty years of age. He then went abroad, and formed an agreeable and useful connection of intimacy with the well known Rufus King. In Paris he contracted strong Gallican sympathies, which, with what he saw later in England, gave him a bias which materially affected his subsequent public views. On his return he devoted himself sedulously to the labors of his profession, and served for a time as clerk of one of the courts.

In 1808 he published a pamphlet entitled *A View of the Rights and Wrongs, Power and Policy of the United States of America*, and fearlessly criticised the tendency to admire everything English at the expense of America. His views were regarded by many as audacious as well as peculiar; but, daunted in no respect, in 1811 he published *Inchiquin, the Jesuit's Letters*, a spirited defense of American character, a book which created a stir in those days, provoking the attack of the British *Quarterly Review*. By this time he had broken away from the views of the strict Federalists, and it is not surprising to find him uniting himself most ardently with the "War Hawks" and sustaining, by voice and pen, the war measures of Madison. In the fall of 1812 he was elected to Congress at the age of thirty, but so youthful in appearance was he that he was denied admittance by the door-keeper. Here he spoke with great freedom and met with plainness Mr. Webster's views of New England opposition involving threats of disunion. He spoke also upon the draft of the militia, upon the loan bill, and the right of search, and poured forth a torrent of invective against the English for their inhuman use of their Indian allies. He insisted upon the regulation of the British extension by construction of blockade; upon a limitation of their inordinate catalogue of contraband; upon no search for men, and upon a



qualified ascertained and moderate search for things. He collided severely with Stockton, of New Jersey, and maintained himself with commendable ability. We cannot too much admire this portion of his career. It deserves the study of all those students, even in New England, who, under the lead of Schouler, are willing to throw aside local prejudices and examine questions broadly.

Failing to secure a re-election because of the defeat of his party, Mr. Ingersoll retired in 1814 from the arena of Congress to assume the duties of United States district attorney, succeeding Mr. Dallas, who had been appointed Secretary of the Treasury. He held his place for fourteen years, a term of service never equalled by any other district attorney, and entered upon a long period of great activity at the bar. He was a hard worker, and a dangerous opponent, and there are many traditions repeated by very old men of his brilliancy and force as an orator. He corresponded actively with Madison, Monroe, Dallas, Rufus King and Richard Rush, then minister to England, and gave to the last named, in the form of a diary, a most lifelike series of sketches of men and events which are valuable as contemporaneous portraitures of the time. At the same time he delivered and published historical commemorative addresses. He advocated internal state improvements, canals and roads, and was far in advance in support of railroads, then of unknown merit. He took high ground in favor of the tariff, and at the same time was in favor of extending our commerce with foreign countries by exchanging commodities on the basis of equality, thus anticipating in a high degree the reciprocity of our day. In 1830-31 he served a single term in the state assembly, and was an unsuccessful candidate for the Senate of the United States. He became an ardent supporter of Jackson, of whom he said: "by the master stroke of a mere toast he *nullified the nullification* he was invited to magnify;" and this, notwithstanding the fact that he had been removed from his office of district attorney by Jackson, because of charges which he subsequently met with success, and notwithstanding his difference of view as to the Bank of the United States. The part Mr. Ingersoll took in the burning questions of the day is well and clearly told, and the development of his views upon matters of finance is sketched in strong lines. In 1837 he was a member of the state constitutional convention, and addressed himself to the improvement of the public school system, and the judiciary. The latter, he argued, should be "independent but not irresponsible." He fought the doctrines of the Dartmouth College case in the matter of corporations, and also took strong ground against inconvertible paper money. As a hard-money democrat he was defeated in 1836 for Congress, but was successful, after an intermediate defeat, in 1841. For eight years he held his place, and took a leading part in the discussion of the Federal-Treasury system, the banking system, Texas and the Mexican War, slavery, the disputes with England over the case of the Caroline, the Oregon boundary, and the North-eastern boundary. He served on the judiciary committee, and was chairman of the committee on foreign affairs. He strongly advocated

the annexation of Texas, and argued against the views of Abolitionists as fraught with ruin to the country. On this point his biographer defends him against the views of Schouler and Von Holst. This portion we consider the least satisfactory of the book. In the case of the Caroline and the boundary disputes he scourged the timidity of Webster, and later came into direct conflict with him, charging the improper retention and expenditure of public funds belonging to the secret service. Upon this matter he preferred charges, which an investigating committee, while perfunctorily exonerating Webster, left open to the inference that they were not unfounded. It was unfortunate that the attack was made; it is an instance of Mr. Ingersoll's indiscretion, for whatever the foundation the fact remains that Mr. Webster was too important and influential a character to be publicly immolated. Mr. Webster's escape was largely due to the action of Jefferson Davis. In the spring of 1847 Mr. Ingersoll was nominated by Polk for the French mission, but failed of confirmation in the Senate, on the representation by Webster that his success would be an endorsement of the charges against himself. With the expiration of the Thirtieth Congress Mr. Ingersoll retired from public life at the age of sixty-seven, and devoted himself to the practice of the law, and to historical work. He published a *History of the War of 1812*, a volume of *Recollections*, and a pamphlet upon *African Slavery in America*, aiming to avoid the fermentation of excitement. He spent much time in the company of exiled French officers who sought, with Joseph Bonaparte, an asylum in Philadelphia—Grouchy, Clausel, Bernard, Desnouettes, Vandamme and others. The well-known Mrs. Maury gives charming descriptions of his attractive personality, while Judge Sharswood and others describe him as an extraordinary advocate at the bar. He affected some oddities in dress, but was always welcome in society as an interesting talker. He deprecated late in life the abolition movement, and advocated the election of Breckenridge and Lane, but when the shock of war came he approved of Mr. Lincoln's call for volunteers and was a friend of the Union, while disapproving of ultra measures. But he was an old man, who had long outlived his contemporaries in active life, and expired in 1862, when nearly eighty years of age.

Mr. Meigs has given us an interesting and useful book, which can be read with profit. It is free from partisanship, and while at times it lacks spirit in the narrative, it is on the whole a judicious and well-executed biography.

HAMPTON L. CARSON.

*Ulysses S. Grant, and the Period of National Preservation and Reconstruction.* By W. C. CHURCH, Brevet Lieutenant Colonel U. S. Vols. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1897. Pp. xi, 473.)

*General Grant.* By JAMES GRANT WILSON. (New York: D. Appleton and Co. 1897. Pp. vi, 390.)

*General Grant's Letters to a Friend*, 1861-1880. With introduction and notes by JAMES GRANT WILSON. (New York and Boston: T. Y. Crowell and Co. 1897. Pp. x, 132.)

THE first of these volumes belongs to the "Heroes of the Nations" series. It is beautifully printed, on excellent paper. There are clear and well-executed maps of Grant's campaigns. The various portraits of Grant, of many of the chief officers with whom he served, of Lincoln, Greeley, Seymour and Lee, and the views of Grant's birth-place, the house where the first surrender took place, and his tomb, are good.

In the eighty pages which deal with the birth, ancestry, education of Grant, his early experiences as a soldier in Mexico, and his career thereafter up to the outbreak of the Civil War, Col. Church has made the best presentation of this period of Grant's life made by any writer who has attempted to present them in such compact form.

In treating of the earlier movements preceding and attending the opening of the Cumberland and Tennessee rivers, including Belmont, Paducah, Forts Henry and Donelson, and Shiloh, the author has examined matters for himself instead of, as has been too frequently the practice, following histories and memoirs written either too soon after the events, or without due regard to the official records. Under such treatment, Shiloh appears as it was, a thorough surprise—no infantry pickets on some points of the Union line in advance of the ordinary chain of camp guards; a regiment attacking the Confederate advance supposing it an outpost; men found in their blankets asleep, and others at breakfast.

The chapters on the siege and surrender of Vicksburg vividly sketch this momentous campaign. The treatment of the battle of Iuka and subsequent movements does great injustice to Rosecrans from a failure to examine the official records, and from repeating exploded versions instead.

The handling of matters about Chattanooga will be a surprise to all who have informed themselves about the notable operations in that quarter. The trouble arises in this case also from failing to follow the record. The reader is informed that Bragg endeavored on August 17, 1863, "to turn Rosecrans' flank and envelop his right, but he was driven back after sharp fighting" and that "on the 18th Rosecrans continued a movement for strengthening his right." As a matter of fact, at this time the Tennessee River and two mountain ranges—one of the latter sixty miles across—separated Bragg from Rosecrans, and the armies did not come into each other's presence until three weeks after the dates named. Col. Church says: "By a brilliant strategic movement he (Rosecrans) secured possession of Chattanooga on September 19th; and the battle of Chickamauga followed on September 20th and 21st." The small detachment of Union troops which occupied Chattanooga before the battle of Chickamauga entered it ten days before the date given; the battle of Chickamauga was on the 19th and 20th, and there was no battle on the 21st. The statement that "two weeks after Chickamauga, Rosecrans was re-enforced by the arrival of Hooker's forces" will create the impres-

sion that these troops actually reached Rosecrans. As a matter of fact, they could not be advanced further than Bridgeport, beyond the mountains, until five weeks after Chickamauga, and did not reach Chattanooga until ten days after Rosecrans had been relieved.

To show how ready the quiet Grant was to assert his position and authority on all proper occasions, Gen. Hooker is represented as sending a spring wagon to the train to meet Gen. Grant on his arrival at Chattanooga, when the latter said: "If Gen. Hooker wishes to see me he will find me on this train." Hooker then appeared with offers of hospitality which were declined. This fable disappears with the statement that Grant rode horseback over the mountains to Chattanooga, that no railroad train ran to the city for weeks thereafter, and that Gen. Hooker did not reach Chattanooga until six days after Grant.

The credit of planning the reopening of the Tennessee River to supply the Army of the Cumberland is given to Gen. W. F. Smith, when, as a matter of fact, the official records clearly show that Gen. Rosecrans planned the movement before Gen. Smith reached the western army. It is true that the details were left to Gen. Smith, and that he executed them in the most brilliant manner.

If a reader should undertake to plot the movements in the battles about Chattanooga by implicitly following Col. Church's dates and descriptions the work would become a serious puzzle. Thus Hooker's battle in Lookout Valley is fixed for the day after the enemy left it. Longstreet's corps is represented as remaining at Chattanooga until November 13, though he left for Knoxville on the 4th. The point at which Sherman's forces gathered to cross the Tennessee for the contemplated attack on Missionary Ridge is fixed at Brown's Ferry, a point thirteen miles below where it really took place, and seven miles below Chattanooga, instead of six miles above it. Sherman is represented as securing a position on Missionary Ridge threatening "both flanks of the enemy, and compelling him to strengthen his right at the expense of other portions of his line." Bragg's left flank was eight miles from Sherman. Bragg's weakening his line elsewhere during the battle to strengthen it against Sherman is a myth, early asserted and long maintained, it is true, but nevertheless a pure myth.

The chapter on the "Genesis of a Great Soldier," covering the time from the Chattanooga campaign until the battle of the Wilderness, is one of the most striking yet written in regard to the characteristics of General Grant.

As in the case of the chapter on Chattanooga the story of the movements and great battles from the Rapidan to Richmond contains many errors in date which will greatly confuse readers who are not students of war history. Thus the re-organization of the corps of the Army of the Potomac just before Grant took command is placed on May 4, instead of 24; and the movements of Warren's corps in the battle of Spotsylvania on April 8 instead of May 8. These, with several other slighter differences in date, make it difficult to follow the real sequence of events.

The reader will encounter the same troubles in the chapter on the campaigns of Sherman and Thomas. Thus the noted assault on Kenesaw Mountain is fixed for June 21 instead of 27, and the theory that while unsuccessful it made it possible for Johnston to detach forces to help Lee in Virginia is an amusing novelty that has not made its impress on military history. The treatment of the Tennessee campaign under Thomas, after Sherman had started on his "holiday picnic" to the sea, is excellent. It brings out the truth that Thomas was left at the start with scarcely more than half as many effectives as Hood, and that the army of the latter was virtually destroyed.

The final surrender is graphically presented, and Grant's career as President rapidly, forcibly, and most creditably portrayed, while the picture of his last days is most pathetic.

The volume of Gen. Wilson is one of the "Great Commanders" series, which he has edited. It has one of the best engravings of Grant extant. The maps are sufficient in number, and good. The fac-similes of historical papers, such as the "Unconditional Surrender letter," the appointment as lieutenant-general, and the terms with Lee, are interesting features. The chapters on ancestry, early life, cadetship, Mexican War and subsequent life until the Civil War, present many new points. Belmont, Fort Henry, Donelson and Shiloh follow long-accepted narratives, as they must in the main, though there is no longer any reason for withholding the facts as to the want of every preparation for battle at Shiloh, and the complete surprise which so nearly overwhelmed the Union army.

The severe criticism upon Rosecrans in connection with the Iuka-Corinth campaign cannot be sustained from the records. For instance, instead of failing to pursue in obedience to orders, as charged, Rosecrans insisted upon pursuing, and was ordered not to do so by Grant himself. This error arises from following inaccurate histories instead of examining the official records. The Vicksburg campaign, Grant's masterpiece in strategy, is presented in clear and compact form.

The author in treating the Chattanooga campaign wholly ignores Grant's statement that upon arriving he found that General Thomas had planned for opening the Tennessee river, and the further statement of Thomas, that the plan originated with Rosecrans, and assigns the whole to Grant; another instance of following early myths instead of the open record.

The account of the now well-understood battle of Chattanooga is elaborate and well written, but contains more glaring errors than any previous publication from a writer of standing. For instance, "Wood, Sheridan and Turchin" are represented to be the force which stormed Missionary Ridge. The assaulting force, however, was composed of the divisions of Wood, Sheridan, Johnson and Baird. Turchin's command was only a brigade in Baird's division. This latter is represented as charging with Sherman's troops two miles away from its real assault, and,

says General Wilson, "This charge of Baird's" (which was neither ordered nor made) "was one of the incidents of the day."

But the most striking illustration of the inaccuracy of this book as history is found in the following description (p. 197) of Sherman's first advance against Missionary Ridge:

"At 1 p. m. Sherman gave the order to advance on Missionary Ridge. With a hundred guns playing upon them, and with as many more answering from the Federal heights, his command gained the foot of the advanced spur of Missionary Ridge, climbed it through storms of shot and shell, beat back the bayonets that wreathed its top, clambered over the hot muzzles of the guns upon its summit, and at half-past three planted their banners there, a step nearer the superior heights frowning above. Two brigades were at once ordered to this advanced position to hold it, artillery was brought up and mounted, and soon the captured height was made impregnable to any Confederate force likely to be thrown against it."

As a matter of fact, there was not a gun fired by either side during the entire movement until after Sherman had reached his position, and then only a few between infantry skirmishers. The crest gained had not been occupied by the enemy, and when Sherman advanced at 1 p. m. there was not a single Confederate soldier within a mile and a half of it, not one was dispatched toward it until 2 p. m., and not one reached it at any time.

The eastern campaigns are presented in an interesting manner, though not altogether free from the Chattanooga method, and the reader will be attracted by the chapters on the political life, the entertaining private correspondence, the trip around the world, and the story of the last days and death of the great captain.

The most important aim of writers and publishers at this distance from the war should be accuracy. When the official record can be commanded by every one, there is no excuse either for writers or publishers in marring their work with serious errors which a few hours' examination of the *War Records* series would enable them to eliminate.

General Wilson's *Letters to a Friend* is, from first to last, a deeply interesting volume. It contains fifty letters written by General Grant to his friend Elihu B. Washburne in the freedom and the confidence of their close relations. They treat of officers, of campaigns, of reasons for action, of policies, of cruel criticisms, of political affairs, of his observations abroad—and all in the simple style and interesting method for which General Grant was noted. It is in every way, except for its brevity, a most satisfactory volume.

H. V. BOYNTON.

*Life of General George Gordon Meade, Commander of the Army of the Potomac.* By RICHARD MEADE BACHE. (Philadelphia: Henry T. Coates and Co. 1897. Pp. xxii, 596.)

THE announcement of a life of Meade by a near relative who was old enough to recollect the current impressions of the general's career whilst



the Civil War was raging, excited hopes of a memoir full of the personality of the man. The book turns out to be, rather, a narrative of the campaigns of the Army of the Potomac; and the intimate history of Meade is limited to a dozen pages at the beginning and a score at the end of the volume. We cannot even say that the comments on the several campaigns represent Meade's views; for he is rarely quoted, and the author informs us in the preface that he does not remember "ever having asked him a question about the war, or his ever having volunteered to speak of it, or having spoken of it to me."

Looking into the work as a new narrative on a theme often treated before, we find the standpoint of the writer to be that of a group of the younger officers who surrounded General Meade, who, starting with the intensest prejudices against the men who succeeded McClellan, transferred the dislike with equal hostility to Grant and Sheridan, when Meade was superseded in the independent command of the Potomac army. Mr. Bache was not an army officer, but he was born of army stock, was himself a civil engineer employed on army fortifications, and, as his book abundantly shows, has remained one of the coterie which has cherished the belief that military guidance of the army ended when Grant and Sheridan came from the West to play their rôles in front of Washington.

It would be hard to imagine a more interesting book than one written from such a standpoint, if only the author had buckled to his thesis with thoroughness equal to his courage, and could show us that he had mastered the material that the *Official Records* contain. As we follow him step by step, however, we find so manifest a lack of knowledge of essential documents, that the bottom drops out of each basketful of proofs of the weakness and incapacity of his *bêtes noires*, big and little.

To begin with the first battle of Bull Run, the proposition is that we must transfer from General Patterson to General Scott the responsibility for the fact that the former did not reinforce McDowell whilst Johnston went unhindered to Beauregard to turn the tide of battle against the Union army. A warm, kindly feeling toward a man who had served his country with distinction in the Mexican war and had in many ways proved his title to the name of a good and useful citizen, would make it a grateful task to relieve Patterson of censure; but more than one student of the period has found that, to do this, one must reckon with the relentless logic which Colonel Livermore has put into his analysis of the records, in his paper published by the Military Historical Society of Massachusetts.<sup>1</sup> In a new treatment of the subject, that analysis must be met point by point, or the debate had much better be let alone. Mr. Bache gives no sign that he is aware of this.

General Pope was an officer of the Engineers, presumed, by the standards accepted in the army, to have the intellectual equipment worthy of his rank, as he certainly had courage and vigor. He paid a sharp penalty for wounding the self-love of the Potomac army, and Mr. Bache has not outgrown the old animosity. He is unfortunate, however, when

<sup>1</sup> *Campaigns in Virginia*, Vol. I., p. 3.

he selects Pope's resistance to the Confederate advance from Cedar Mountain and Culpeper as evidence of lack of judgment. He thinks Pope should at once have marched in retreat to the old lines at Centerville, close to Washington, and that he only resisted Lee because he had, by his address to the army, put "a military chip on his shoulder." As the purpose on the National side was to gain time for McClellan's army to come from the James River to join him, strenuous resistance was the plainest dictate of wisdom, and it is selecting a strong point to make an attack there. That, at least, was a merit and not a weakness. But strong or weak, Pope was not to be judged by it, for in this respect he was following Halleck's explicit orders. The policy of a stubborn, dilatory fight had been adopted from the time McClellan's return had been determined upon, and was constantly reiterated. "Stand firm," said Halleck, "until I can help you. Fight hard and aid will come soon."<sup>1</sup> McClellan was notified that the policy laid down for Pope was to "fight in retreat and dispute every inch of ground" if forced to fall back.<sup>2</sup>

In the campaign of Antietam General Burnside is offered up as the scapegoat, and though idolatry of McClellan is no longer in vogue and no book was ever more discredited as an authority than his *Own Story*, its assertions are here assumed to be conclusive even in contradiction of matter in which the official reports of McClellan and Burnside, made at the time, are in accord. It is enough that thereby Burnside is to be condemned. McClellan as well as Burnside had said in reports made soon after the battle, that Burnside received the order to attack the enemy's position at the lower stone bridge at ten o'clock, and it was not till McClellan had been removed from the command of the army and Burnside had been his successor, that he changed his statement and said that the latter was ordered to attack at eight o'clock.<sup>3</sup> Granting that other testimony might be found more or less strongly supporting the one view or the other, a historical writer is not warranted in saying "there is no doubt of the substantial accuracy of this account of McClellan's." And as if in retribution, there was going through the press at the same time with Mr. Bache's work a supplemental volume of the *Official Records* in which the original of the long-lost order is given with the hour of 9:10 a. m. at its head, its writing, enclosure and transmittal from Pry's house to the heights above Burnside's bridge, full two miles as the crow flies, being after that time.<sup>4</sup>

In the author's mind, no contemptuous epithets seem too strong for his characterizations of Burnside. They become mere lampooning, and are repeated with gusto as often as opportunity can be made. And who was Burnside? A man who, having received his education at the Military Academy at West Point, promptly volunteered on the first call of the President, though he had left the army and was in important civil

<sup>1</sup> *O. R.*, XII., pt. 3, pp. 591, 622.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*, p. 627.

<sup>3</sup> *O. R.*, XIX., pt. I, pp. 31, 419.

<sup>4</sup> *O. R.*, LI., pt. I, p. 844.

business. Taking the field as colonel of a Rhode Island regiment, his promotions came as the recognition of honorable service. At the head of a difficult and important expedition to the Carolina coast he won successes that were among the first to cheer the hearts of a loyal people. Coming back to help retrieve the disasters of McClellan's campaign against Richmond, the latter found in him a friend whom he could absolutely trust and was effusive in warmest expressions of affection. He went to Washington to advocate McClellan's cause, and the offer to himself of the command of the army gave him the power, in refusing it, to secure his friend's reinstatement at its head. He had conferred too great a favor, and the general recognition of the fact that he stood in the possible line of succession, must be held to have been the cause of jealousy, and at last, of enmity. When McClellan's fall came, Burnside still labored for his friend, and it cannot be denied that his unwillingness to take the command was honest and unfeigned. When disaster came to himself, he signaled his pure patriotism by seeking some less onerous post, where he could still serve his country. In East Tennessee he again proved capacity and courage, as even his enemies were finally forced to admit. Returning to the army at the East, he soon offered, of his own motion, to exchange his independent command under Grant for one of subordination under Meade, who had lately been his own subordinate, in order to simplify the working of the army machinery. His character commanded esteem and respect in every situation, whether in prosperity or in misfortune, in the field or in the Senate. His limitations, his faults may be, nay, must be, dissected by the historian; but right-minded people will be shocked whenever such a character is made the object of cynical satire. The smallest of his undisputed successes would have made the fortune of most of those who sneer at him.

In Mr. Bache's treatment of Grant, if for brevity's sake we select a typical example of his misjudgments, we may find it in his thrice-repeated assertion that Grant had unjustly "overshadowed" Meade by taking the field with the Potomac army, though "he had expressly stated that, as being in command of all the armies in the field, his proper place was in Washington."<sup>1</sup>

Anyone passably familiar with the Rebellion history will at once recall that Grant had, with what was unusual vehemence for him, declared, from the first news of his appointment to the new grade of lieutenant-general, that nothing could induce him to do as Halleck had done in this matter of making Washington his personal headquarters. Being summoned there on March 4, 1864, he wrote to Sherman: "I start in the morning to comply with the order, but I shall say very distinctly on my arrival there, that I will accept no appointment which will require me to make that city my headquarters."<sup>2</sup> He stuck to his word, and the order which the President as Commander-in-chief made on March 11th, declared that "The headquarters of the army will be in Washington, and also with

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 364, 401, 554.

<sup>2</sup> *O. R.*, XXXII, pt. 3, p. 18.

Lieutenant-General Grant *in the field.*" As to the Washington office, the same order assigned General Halleck "to duty *in Washington* as Chief of Staff of the army, under the direction of the Secretary of War and the Lieutenant-General commanding."<sup>1</sup>

Here we have the prompt execution of Grant's purpose and the organization of command which he maintained till the peace. It is therefore with a sort of bewilderment that one finds Mr. Bache talking of Grant's having "expressly stated" and made "his own confession" that he was, all the rest of the war, "absent from the place where he should have been." No book discussing subjects of controversy in our Civil War ought now to be published without explicit reference to authorities, but Mr. Bache gives us none. Running the matter down, we seem to find it in Grant's *Personal Memoirs*,<sup>2</sup> where he tells of his visit to Meade at Brandy Station on the 10th of March (the day before the order cited above was issued), and says "It had been my intention before this to remain in the West, even if I was made Lieutenant-general; but when I got to Washington and saw the situation, it was plain that here was the point for the commanding general to be." The "here" manifestly meant with the Army of the Potomac, for he is at its headquarters in consultation with its commander. The antithesis is between "here" and "the West," where he had previously expected to be in the field. To interpret this as meaning that he thought it his duty to stay in the city of Washington would be untenable if not another word were found to show Grant's purpose; but when we read what he had written to Sherman and see him going back to the President and having an order issued the very next day which proclaimed his purpose to take the field; when the enemy seized upon the order, and we find their leaders telling each other that they must prepare to meet Grant in Virginia; the gloss upon Grant's words becomes an amusing example of the blindness of prejudice.

The blindness is scarcely less when Mr. Bache declares it to be "favoritism" which gave Sherman the opportunity for "separate military renown" which was denied to Meade. Sherman had almost passionately begged Grant to stay in the West. No ambition for "separate military renown" had prevented him from urging that it was alike for Grant's renown and for the interest of the country that Grant should remain at the head of the western army though it should keep himself a subordinate. He had a magnificent vision of that great army under Grant's leadership sweeping across Georgia to the sea and northward again to Richmond, making "short work" of the seceding Atlantic States when "our task is done" in the West.<sup>3</sup> If things had gone on in Virginia in 1864 as they had in 1863 it would not have been strange if Sherman's vision had been realized in 1865 by Grant's receiving Lee's surrender somewhere between the Potomac and the Rappahannock, coming from the south with the army of the West. It was with the honest purpose to let

<sup>1</sup> Id., p. 58.

<sup>2</sup> II. 116.

<sup>3</sup> O. R., XXXII., pt. 3, p. 49.

the noble Army of the Potomac vanquish its own enemy that Grant gave up the more attractive vision, and the book before us is evidence of the scant thanks he got for it from those who should have been first in gratitude. It is hard to repress derisive laughter when a nephew of Meade quotes against Grant the Spanish equivalent of the English proverb, "One beat the bush and another caught the bird."

If history shows anything it is that the law to make Grant lieutenant-general (for his name might as well have been in its text) was passed when Congress and the country were almost in despair because the victory of Gettysburg was followed by six months of inaction or harmless peripatetics between Washington and Culpeper; because Lee was kept so little employed by a superior army that he dared to send one-third of his smaller force away to help Bragg beat Rosecrans at Chickamauga, and no advantage was taken of it. Had Meade clung to Lee in '63 as Sherman did to Johnston in '64, so that his campaign, like the other, would have been known among the soldiers as the "hundred days under fire," Richmond might have been taken nearly a year before Atlanta, and we should never have heard of its captor being "overshadowed" by anybody. He had his chance.

There is in Mr. Bache's book a good deal of careful analysis of army movements, much good topographical description, aided by maps which he has skilfully modified to meet the wants of the general reader. Its real significance, however, is in the controversial matter of which samples have been given, and with which every chapter is full. He has often been obliged to stop short in his campaign details because the scale to which he was writing would make his book too large, and this has prevented him from giving the reader the means of testing the value of the general judgments which he announces.

*The Battle of Franklin, Tennessee, November 30, 1864.* A Monograph. By JACOB D. COX, Late Major-General Commanding Twenty-third Army Corps. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1897. Pp. x, 351.)

GENERAL COX—scholar, practised writer and excellent officer—gives the public in this volume a very clear account of the campaign in Tennessee under Gen. Thomas, after Gen. Sherman had left Hood, who had long resisted Sherman's three armies, to be taken care of by Thomas with the fragments, when 62,000 selected men had been withdrawn by Sherman for his March to the Sea. The general view of the situation, and the strategy of the campaign, the statement of the tactics and the description of the fighting at Franklin, are excellent. But the assumption in the outset, as if it were not a matter to be questioned, that Gen. Thomas was left with adequate forces, is wholly unsupported by the facts, as is now well known by all participants. It will attract the reader's attention to find in the opening paragraph that Franklin itself as a hard-fought field would not justify the volume, but that full cause for publication will be

found, among other things, in the fact that this battle marked the "beginning of the end" of the Civil War, and justified Sherman in the division of his forces for the March to the Sea. As very few students of war history will accept those positions, they will, naturally, seek another reason for publication. This they will not find clearly revealed until they reach the last two chapters, with the titles, "An unexpected Controversy," and "Controverted Points." The contention, here made clear, is that Gen. Cox selected the line of battle at Franklin, and commanded the line throughout the battle, except as Gen. Stanley, of the Fourth Corps, came up at the time of the break in the line, helped to restore it, was immediately wounded and left the field. That Gen. Cox's book was written as an introduction to this controversy sufficiently appears from the paragraph which precedes the final chapter setting forth the points of his controversy. "The fulness of the narrative in the preceding pages will enable me to make the summary comparatively brief." A space equal to one fourth of the volume is then devoted to the points of contention given above.

While there is no question of Gen. Cox's ability and energy in establishing the line indicated to him by Gen. Schofield, rapidly and effectively entrenching it, and supplementing it all by distinguished conduct in action, the claim which he makes, which is virtually that of commanding in the battle, cannot be sustained. Gen. Schofield occupied a most commanding position, immediately overlooking the whole field, where he could direct everything, not only on the line where Cox's two divisions were fighting, but upon the other very important portions of the line occupied by Stanley's troops, including the points where the Union cavalry were engaged, and where other troops of Stanley were posted to observe movements of the enemy threatening the Union rear. Gen. Schofield, in his recently published book, twice records that he personally directed Gen. Cox where to form the troops as they came up, this being committed to Cox because Gen. Stanley was commanding the rear guard and engaging the enemy to retard his advance. In regard to the remaining point of Gen. Cox's contention, Gen. Schofield, being called on by Gen. Cox as the officer in supreme command for his understanding of the matter, wrote:

"It has seemed to me that your use of the term 'Commandant upon the line' was unfortunate, it being liable to be misunderstood as intended to imply that you had been assigned to the command of all the troops in line on the south side of the river. The contingency which was anticipated of an attempt of the enemy to force a crossing of the river above Franklin, which would, or might, have taken Stanley to some distant point on the north side of the river, and which might thus have led to your assignment to the command of all the troops remaining on the south side, did not happen." General Schofield wrote Gen. Stanley as positively in regard to the matter, declaring further that Stanley was where he should have been throughout the battle.

While these things effectually dispose of the points for the establish-



ment of which the book was written, its non-controversial chapters, which make up three-quarters of the volume, undoubtedly present the best account of the movements in the battle of Franklin yet published.

The discussion of the division of Sherman's forces when he decided to leave Hood in his rear for Thomas to deal with, while with all his army except two small corps, the convalescents, and the sick, he started for the sea, is seriously marred by withholding several essential elements without which there can be no fair presentation of the case. For example, the force which Sherman took to the sea is stated at "about 50,000." Sherman himself in his *Memoirs* says it was 62,204, that "the most extraordinary efforts had been made to purge the army," and "that all on this exhibit may be assumed to have been able-bodied, experienced soldiers, well armed, well equipped and provided, as far as human foresight could, with all the essentials of life, strength, and vigorous action." On the other hand, of those sent back to Thomas, the terms of service of 15,000 expired within a week after Hood's movement began, and their places were in part supplied with 12,000 perfectly new troops. It was necessary to ransack the hospitals and organize convalescents for the field, and also, at last, to put citizens and quartermasters' employes into the ranks, and Thomas, when the real situation was discovered at Washington, was urged to send north for militia. While this was the condition confronting Thomas, and while both Schofield and Thomas reported officially that at the time of Franklin Hood largely outnumbered the Union force, General Cox gives Hood's strength as 42,000 or 43,000, and asserts that "The effective force under General Thomas, in middle and southern Tennessee, was 65,000 officers and men present for duty equipped, which was the official phrase indicating complete readiness for active service." This single statement, in the light of the facts given above, to which he makes no reference, should dispose of his book as history; and also of the theory which General Cox advances that the writing of his book is justified by the demonstration which Franklin gives that Sherman made a proper division of his army when he marched away from Hood to the sea.

H. V. BOYNTON.

*Report and Accompanying Papers of the Commission appointed by the President of the United States "to investigate and report upon the true divisional Line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana."* (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1897. Four vols., pp. 406, 723, 517; Vol. IV., atlas of 76 plates.)

THESE volumes may be considered as products of American scholarship, apart entirely from the policy that gave rise to them. They are undoubtedly the best contribution hitherto made towards clearing up the merits of the boundary dispute. This indeed is not very high praise, for the previous contributions, at least the official ones, were not of the highest order. The interminable series of "statements," "cases" and

“memoranda” put forward by Venezuelan agents have in them lamentably little that is at once relevant to the question and useful towards deciding it. The “case” for the English colony, on the other hand, was tardily scrambled together under pressure of threatened war. It was based on insufficient research, made by persons who had had no thorough training in selecting and translating significant passages from foreign records, to say nothing of the higher task of collating and sifting the evidence so obtained. As a result, Sir Frederick Pollock’s able and temperate statement was in part vitiated at the outset by defects in his materials. It was also of course a one-sided presentation. There was still, therefore, need of a thorough search of the sources and a review of the evidence by competent hands; and this the members of our Commission have evidently sought to bring about. They were fortunate in their choice for the most difficult part of the undertaking, of Professor George Lincoln Burr as their agent. Valuable service was done by Professor J. F. Jameson in investigating the beginnings of European settlement in Guiana; and by Mr. Mallet-Prevost, the late Dr. Winsor and Mr. Marcus Baker in working up the geographical features of the question. But it is no injustice to these others to say that the most important and valuable contents of these volumes come from Professor Burr.

Our worthy Secretary of State who asserted that the Guiana boundary question was a matter of “weighing simple historical evidence” ought, in poetical justice, to have been required to do the weighing himself. I doubt whether all history could supply an example of more baffling, complicated and unsatisfactory evidence. The evidence of tradition is conflicting and shadowy. Records are vague and full of gaps, important maps are lost, sites of former occupation cannot be definitely fixed. The disputed territory has for landmarks almost exclusively rivers, and every river has either several names (Indian, Spanish, Dutch, French, English) or several ways of spelling what is supposed to be one and the same name. Many rivers have names so nearly alike that everything depends on a single letter. There is a Baroma and a Barama and a Barima and a Barimani; all four are neighboring streams. The name of the first is spelled in at least twenty-five different ways, and the rest have variations of their own. The second and third are at the burning point of the boundary controversy. To add to this charming simplicity, the map-makers frequently interchanged the name of the Barima with its neighbor the Amacura; and when a document represents the Barima as the boundary of Dutch territory it may be quite uncertain which river is intended.

In unravelling the tangle of tangles in which the geography of the disputed region is involved, Professor Burr has performed some really remarkable feats. For example, the identification of “Creek Mejou” in a Dutch document, with the river Curumu (Vol. I., p. 390); or, for an example of insight, sustained alertness and skill in marshalling detached bits of evidence, take the processes by which he determines approximately the sites of the successive Dutch posts on the Cuyuni—that river of the interior which figures so much in the boundary dispute. I wish it

were possible to quote the passage in which he speaks of Schomburgk's Indian tradition as fixing the site of one of these posts and giving the name of the post-holder, "Palmsteen." The site is now shown, by a record which Schomburgk could not have seen, to have been correctly indicated by tradition, and Mr. Burr, recalling the Indian tendency to mix l's and r's, reconciles "Palmsteen" with the true name, Pierre Martin, preserved in the record (Vol. I., p. 344).

In his efforts to clear up the facts of occupation from stage to stage, it seems to me Professor Burr has been eminently successful. Unless new evidence be discovered, it is doubtful whether anything further can be drawn from the materials now available. His arguments and inferences as to territorial claims are less likely to be accepted by everybody concerned. As to the primary question whether the Dutch legislators used the Orinoco river as a limit of their territorial rights, possessions or jurisdiction, I think he has not succeeded in overturning the essential part of the case for the colony. He has, indeed, supplied some important corrections in the copying and translating of the chief documents; but the fact remains that Dutch legislation made a distinction between the region east of the Orinoco and the region west of it; that for "the Wild Coast" east of it they legislated freely as to founding colonies, undertaking to authorize and govern settlements at any point settlers might select; west of the Orinoco they made no such pretensions. And when Professor Burr contends that when the Orinoco is thus named as a limit in Dutch legislation about Dutch affairs, "it is as the first Spanish point, and not as the last Dutch one, that it is named," he seems to me to come dangerously near to mere hair-splitting. First Spanish point or last Dutch point, it amounts to a denial of Spanish sovereignty and an assertion of Dutch rights east of the Orinoco. Mr. Burr argues much from the fact that the Dutch did not at once assert an *exclusive* right to plant colonies in Guiana; but I think he looks too much at mere words and too little at the facts. Mere verbal assertion of exclusive sovereignty would have been of small value in 1621; the only assertion that could avail was actual occupation of various points on the coast. It seems to me also that even verbal assertion of exclusive sovereignty is plainly enough contained in the company's "conditions for colonies" of 1627-8; I hardly see how it could be more strongly stated. However that may be, it seems not worth while to spend much time on the question, unless we are to maintain that the situation was controlled to the end by the phrases of 1621. It will hardly be suggested that Holland, to the close of her hold on western Guiana, would have allowed any other country to plant a colony on its coast, without resistance! If not, it seems to me that any argument from the terms of early documents, however interesting historically, is of little value for present purposes. Mr. Burr's own researches would seem to warrant the opinion that if British Guiana fails to get the boundary placed near to the Orinoco it will not be for lack of evidence that the Dutch claimed exclusive jurisdiction up to that limit.

The treatment of the evidence of geographers occupies the whole of Volume III. Here Professor Burr contributes a paper on such official or semi-official maps as he was able to find. His work in hunting down maps officially referred to, and in using their contents, deserves the highest recognition. Dr. Winsor's paper on the history of the boundaries as shown on various classes of maps is clear and good, but somewhat too general for definiteness of results. Mr. Mallet-Prevost, secretary of the Commission, presents a longer, but, as it seems to me, not wholly satisfactory paper on the same ground. He gives too much the impression of laboring to break the force of the map evidence that runs so strongly against Venezuela. Lack of space forbids discussion here of the theory he maintains as to the origin of the Sanson line, the D'Anville line, etc. Even granting all that he contends for, the fact remains that the great majority of reputable map-makers long held that Spain's territory ended at or near the mouth of the Orinoco. Whether they did or did not mean to assign the territory east of the Spanish boundary to the Dutch (and it is quite clear that most of them did) their evidence cannot be brushed aside by unsupported conjecture; they represent the common report and prevailing impression of their day as to the state of territorial rights in that part of the world. It is as futile as it is unfair to assume that the geographers used nothing but old maps in making new ones. There is a very considerable body of literature which was available and was certainly used in the drawing of maps. It would have been well if the best of it, so far as pertinent, had been included within the scope of the Commission's inquiries. The geographers were aware that Spain had settlements up the Orinoco but none on the coast. They knew that Holland had settlements on the coast and was reputed to claim it to the neighborhood of the Orinoco. A "line" they could hardly avoid drawing, and where would it so well accord with facts as when drawn at the point where river-bank meets sea-coast? The direction inland was, I think, an arbitrary matter; nobody knew anything of the country and probably D'Anville meant to halve the angle between coast-line and river-line. But he certainly had no thought of setting himself up as "a judge and a divider" over the Spanish and the Dutch. The accordance of his line with the known facts seems to have satisfied both himself and his successors,—at least those who did not set up preconceived theory above facts. There were some who assigned to Spain all the territory in South America that no other country had actually occupied; these drew the boundary at the Pomeroon. There were others, few and obscure, who were disposed to deny, with the Venezuelans, that any other country could obtain ownership of any part without Spain's express grant; these, interpreting the treaty of 1648 in their own way, drew the line at the Essequibo, thus placing a part of the Dutch colony in Spanish territory. It is, however, somewhat surprising to find Bonne and Poirson put in this group as having "denied to the Dutch any rights whatever west of the Essequibo." Of some six or seven maps of this region by Bonne, just one, the one reproduced in the Commission's atlas, a small-scale general

map of South America, may bear this construction, though not of necessity. At all events, all the other maps by Bonne give at least the Pomerion to the Dutch, and one puts the boundary at the Orinoco (*Atlas Moderne*, Paris, 1771). And as to Poirson, the only authority for placing him in this list is a German map attributed to him, which has no engraved boundary at the coast. All the genuine Poirson maps, printed from his own plates, concede the Pomerion basin to the Dutch; and even this doubtful German translation shows the Dutch New Middelburg, etc., west of the hand-colored boundary.

Mr. Baker's laudable work in writing a geographical description of Guiana, and in listing the known maps of the region, suffered most by the sudden interruption of the Commission's labors. It is to be hoped he may be authorized to complete his project, and to include in it the evidence of historians, travellers and others who have left on record any word that bears on the main question.

The point most likely to interest readers of this review is, I suppose, the general bearing of the work done for the Commission on the respective claims of Venezuela and British Guiana. That is a matter of opinion. While some of the grounds on which the colonists base their case are shown to be untenable, other grounds are strengthened. The gross result is, as it ought to be, rather to help the arbitrators than to help either party. One feature of the work has seemed to me somewhat unfortunate in this view. The general course and tone of the writing run much as a hostile criticism of the British case. This was perhaps inevitable from the circumstances. It may have been the intention to submit the Venezuelan case to a similar course of critical examination; but there is unfortunately nothing in these volumes to indicate such an intention. Yet the whole work, in spite of this feature, casts a curious light on the extravagant statements once current here as to "English expansion" of claims beyond those made by the Dutch.

S. M. MACVANE.

In Vol. XI. of the *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (Longmans, pp. 212) the most noteworthy pieces are four: Professor York Powell's account of the École des Chartes and plea for a similar institution in England; Major Martin A. S. Hume's narrative, presenting the most recent information concerning some of the survivors of the Armada who went ashore in Ireland; Mr. W. J. Corbett's very interesting account of some Elizabethan village surveys, derived from the muniments of King's College, Cambridge, and relating chiefly to lands in Norfolk; and Rev. J. Neville Figgis's article on some political theories of the early Jesuits. Mr. I. S. Leadam prints a document describing the pursuit of certain of the English refugees on the Continent by emissaries of Queen Mary. Mr. Oscar Browning casts some new light on the conference of Pillnitz, derived from the letters of Morton Eden, English minister at Dresden, to his brother Lord Auckland, minister at the Hague. Mr. W. F. Lord gives a history of Goree. It is not yet time for the fruits of the society's

alliance with the Camden Society to show themselves ; but some of the papers first named are certainly valuable contents.

In Townsend Mac Coun's *The Holy Land in Geography and History* (New York, Townsend Mac Coun, two vols., pp. 96, 126) the technical as well as the general student will find a handy compendium of useful information respecting the geography of Palestine. The author, who is already known through his *Historical Geography of the United States* and kindred publications, is an experienced compiler rather than a Biblical specialist. Fortunately he has made a wise selection of authorities. Availing himself of the valuable researches which have been made by the Palestine Exploration Fund, and of such works as Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, he has presented in a series of 154 small, well executed maps, faced with explanatory material, an interesting array of facts, hitherto not easily accessible to the general reader. These are supplemented by a chronological chart and carefully prepared indexes which add greatly to the usefulness of the work. Indeed, the ease with which it can be used is its best characteristic. With the aid of Vol. I., which is devoted to the consideration of the physical contour of Palestine, it is possible to become intimately acquainted with the topographical peculiarities of that land which is the background of Biblical history and literature. Vol. II., which treats its history from the first day of creation to the present in one hundred and twelve pages, offers more opportunity for adverse criticism. The desire to make the work complete has led, in the earlier period especially, to the presentation as facts of much that at the best is merely hypothetical. The sympathies of the author, however, are with modern methods of Biblical research, and for this reason the second part of the work also cannot fail to be of great service to the general Biblical student, for whom it is primarily intended.

C. F. K.

*The English Constitution : A Commentary on its Nature and Growth*, by Professor Jesse Macy, of Iowa College (New York, The Macmillan Co., pp. xxiii, 534), is not a complete manual of the English constitution, and to judge it properly one needs to bear in mind the author's purpose as stated in the introduction. The author believes that the American student, gaining his ideas of our Constitution chiefly by the study of a written document, is apt to have "an impression that he possesses a knowledge of his own government in advance of his actual knowledge," and to regard the Constitution as more artificial than it really is. The best corrective to these erroneous impressions is a study of the English constitution. To supply a means to this end the author proposes to himself a two-fold task : "First to translate into American forms of speech English descriptions of the English constitution, and second to explain the origin of the present constitution."

Part I. (113 pages) describes the workings of the English constitution in its most prominent features, comparing and contrasting them with



corresponding usages in the United States. The presentation of these matters is often fresh and suggestive, and without doubt the book will prove useful. It is perhaps a fault of the work that it consists too exclusively of broad generalizations. It is in the nature of the case that it should consist largely of them; but the reader will at many points wish that the author had been more definite.

This criticism is still more applicable to Part II., the historical part. It lacks definiteness, and it is all the more unsatisfying because the facts that are wanting are perfectly tangible. We are not forgetting that the author does not propose that this part shall do more than supplement existing histories of the constitution, but the usefulness of the book would certainly have been enhanced if he had given it a greater degree of independence. Often a few briefly mentioned facts would suffice. For example, one could almost believe that the first part of the chapter on the Act of Settlement had been accidentally lost.

In speaking of the contract theory of government, and characterizing the theories of Hobbes and Locke (Ch. XLVII.), Professor Macy follows the very common practice of not distinguishing between the "Contract" of Hobbes and that of Locke. The "original contract between king and people" which King James was charged with violating, was not the "contract" of Hobbes but that of Locke (despite the fact that Locke's *Civil Government* had not yet been published); for according to Hobbes there was no contract between people and sovereign, and he distinctly declares that "there can happen no breach of covenant on the part of the sovereign."

A few typographical errors have been noticed: *Greene* occurs for *Green* (pp. 193, 254); *Gardiner* for *Gairdner* (p. 193); and in the index the name *Gardner* is made to do service for both Mr. James Gairdner and Professor Samuel Rawson Gardiner. More serious is a slip of the pen on p. 317, where "Petition of Right" occurs for "Declaration of Rights."

E. C. B.

The tenth volume published by the Navy Records Society, entitled *Letters and Papers relating to the War with France, 1512-13*, has been edited by M. Alfred Spont. The work displays a considerable amount of industry on the part of the editor, and makes accessible some interesting and valuable matter. In the selection of his materials M. Spont has drawn chiefly upon the great Paris and London collections of MSS., the printed *Calendars*, and local histories. For some reason or other he prefers Holinshed to Grafton. The introduction is confined to a merely chronological narrative of the maritime relations with France during the years 1512-13. It would have seemed more luminous to us if instead he had described the campaigns of the period, and shown us the plans of the various commanders by land and by sea, and the policies of the different members of the Holy Alliance and their allies. In the text students will find materials of value for the history of the year 1513 especi-

ally, among them Prégent's narrative and Echyngham's account, recently used by Professor Clowes. The volume must prove a useful supplement to the works of Oppenheim, of Desjardin and Teulet, and serviceable to the student of both naval and international history. With its English and French and Italian and Latin—one wonders that there is not some Spanish also—it has something of a polyglot character which makes one grateful that the matter has been given the legibility of print at least. The reader will also discover with pleasure the reproduction of several old prints illustrative of the text.

W. D. J.

M. Camille Jullian's *Extraits des Historiens Français du XIX<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris, Hachette, pp. cxxviii, 684) is an admirable book. It is much more than the simple volume of extracts for reading which its title implies. In the 128 pages of its introduction, M. Jullian presents a most excellent account of the development of historical literature and historical studies in France during the present century. Though his form of statement is terse and compact, and he gives many detailed facts, the details are not too many, and abundant room is found for clear, suggestive and critical estimates of the various historians and for luminous expositions of the philosophical and literary theories on which their works were consciously or unconsciously constructed. The relations which each writer bears, in thought and method, to certain of his predecessors, are worked out with especial care. Moreover, in tracing the development through the century of that literary *genre* from which his extracts are borrowed, M. Jullian is not neglectful of the services and influence of the less famous scholars whose labors have provided the literary artists of this and subsequent centuries with materials; he commemorates the quarrymen and masons as well as the architects, and remembers the work of governments, museums, schools and scientific missions. After 1870 the survey becomes less detailed, and living writers are not discussed. At the end comes an interesting summary of the leading principles of historical work which may be extracted out of the nineteenth-century historians as the quintessence of the modern French contribution to the general doctrine of historical method. The extracts which fill the body of the book are taken from the chief works of Chateaubriand, Augustin Thierry, Barante, Guizot, Thiers, Mignet, Michelet, Tocqueville, Quinet, Duruy, Renan, Taine and Fustel de Coulanges. As a rule, several excerpts from each chief book are given, their lengths varying from a page to twenty or twenty-five pages. An adequate impression of the author's manner is thus given; and this is much helped by the frequent practice of including passages from his prefaces, in which he has himself stated, with more or less completeness, the principles upon which he has aimed to proceed.

*The Abolition of Privateering and the Declaration of Paris*, by Francis R. Stark, LL.B., Ph.D. (Columbia University Studies in Political

Science, Vol. VIII., No. 3, pp. 163). Many more faults than this interesting monograph contains would gladly be forgiven to a writer who uses such clear and vigorous English. The materials of the essay, too, have been thoroughly subdued to the author's purpose, to the great profit of the reader.

The essay consists of three parts: I, a discussion of the legal right of capture of private property at sea; II, a comparative sketch of privateering before 1856; III, an account of the abolition of privateering by the Declaration of Paris. The second part is much the best. The third part is a sensible comment on the Declaration as to privateering. The first part is a not very lawyerlike discussion of the legality of capture at sea of the property of individual enemies. An experienced lawyer, for instance, would hardly have laid so much stress on the academical speculations of the French Revolution.

The second and principal part of the essay is in reality a concise history of naval warfare in England, France, and the United States, with something about privateering, and a good deal about piracy and the vicissitudes of the national navies. This is very frankly taken mostly from secondary sources. The merit of the author's work, and it is considerable, consists in having brought conveniently together, in a readable form, so much interesting and valuable information on the subject. Investigation of original authorities might have prevented some mistakes, as in putting into the reign of Elizabeth the surrender by England of the doctrine of *mare clausum*, and in citing the Treaty of Ghent as really a humiliation for England. A little thought ought to have prevented the statement that "it is not illogical" to claim the burning of captured vessels without trial as a belligerent right. But these are small blemishes; one is more inclined to object to an unhistorical slant, apparent in the earlier part of the work, against England and things English.

J. H. B.

Mr. George Hooper's *The Campaign of Sedan* (London, George Bell and Sons, pp. 382) was first published in 1887, and for a number of years has been classed by high military authorities as one of the best books in English on the first part of the Franco-German War (it ends with the downfall of the Second Empire). The book is now reprinted by the publishers. In the preface to the present edition, the author's son states that his father had intended, should a new edition be called for, to revise and correct the work, and to furnish it with an index; but that after due consideration it had been decided to make no addition to the book except that of the index. It is much to be regretted that the author did not correct and revise the book, for it is an able and vivid book, worthy of a careful revision. As it now stands there are throughout the work many small errors and much careless writing. The maps are not what they should be. Especially is this true of the general map of the theatre of operations, which is drawn on an excessively small scale,

presents none of the railways that existed in 1870, is crowded with irrelevant names, and omits many of the names of important towns and rivers mentioned in the text.

*The Romance of Colonization: The United States, from the earliest Times to the Landing of the Pilgrim Fathers*, by G. Barnett Smith (New York, Dodd, Mead and Co., pp. 320). The title of this book will probably not raise great expectations in the reader's mind. In fact, though it is interesting reading, it is neither important nor well-executed, being but a commonplace and unscholarly compilation. Not only do minor errors abound, but in major matters the writer is uncritical, and not well informed as to the present state of competent opinion on a multitude of affairs, from the Northmen and the Cabots down. Long quotations abound. It is not easy to see why in this first volume the colonization of Maryland is treated, before that of Plymouth, instead of being reserved for the second volume, which, we are told, will shortly appear. This second volume will deal with the remainder of the period extending to 1776. Other volumes, exhibiting the romance of English colonization in other lands than those now composing the United States, are mentioned in the preface as probably forthcoming.

Rev. W. H. Whitsitt, D.D., president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary at Louisville, Ky., is the author of a small volume entitled *A Question of Baptist History* (Charles T. Dearing, Louisville, Ky., 1896). In it Dr. Whitsitt presented his reasons for the opinion he had already expressed in *The Independent* and also in *Johnson's New Universal Cyclopaedia*, that immersion was not in use among the Baptists in England until 1641. In an appendix he considered the baptism of Roger Williams, affirming that as Roger Williams, according to Gov. Winthrop, was baptised in March, 1639, it must have been by sprinkling or pouring, "since no other method was at that time in use among the Baptists." To this appendix, Rev. Henry M. King, D.D., the scholarly pastor of the First Baptist Church in Providence, R. I., makes reply in a monograph of one hundred and forty-five pages entitled *The Baptism of Roger Williams* (Preston and Rounds Co., Providence, 1897). For many years Dr. King has given much time to the study of the history of the First Baptist Church in Providence as well as to early New England church history, and in his monograph he subjects Dr. Whitsitt's inferences to a most thorough examination. But he does more. He presents evidence from Roger Williams himself concerning his baptism, also the evidence of his contemporaries, and cites the fact that the testimony of one of these, William Coddington, was so forcible that the late Rev. Dr. Henry M. Dexter said that in the absence of contemporary evidence against immersion Coddington's statement must be accepted as probably correct. This will doubtless be the general verdict as to the matter of the baptism of Roger Williams. The lines of evidence presented by Dr. King confirm and strengthen this opinion expressed by Dr. Dexter.

Under the title *The Revolutionary History of Fort Number Eight, on Morris Heights, New York City*, Professor John C. Schwab has privately printed (New Haven, pp. 66) a narrative of the military events of the Revolutionary war on Manhattan Island and in Westchester County, with especial reference to the relation of those transactions to the fortification named, in which local attachments give him special interest. The narrative is carefully constructed out of general materials on the one hand and on the other hand those of a local and private nature; and is illustrated by a map. A brief history of the manor of Fordham precedes. The amount of matter directly relating to Fort Number Eight is not large.

*The Second Annual Report of the State Historian of the State of New York* (Albany, pp. 1029) is certainly not creditable to the state. If the citizen of New York ever compares such a volume with the historical volumes put forth by the governments of Belgium, the Netherlands, Portugal, Roumania or Switzerland—to select states of less population and revenue than his own—he will feel a chagrin proportioned to his intelligence. The deficiencies of the book are not altogether, perhaps not chiefly, due to the compiler himself. He appears to be energetic and enthusiastic in his work, though he evidently has not the historical education or the technical training which the position would seem to require. The painful thing about the book is the plain evidence it bears that the holder of this honorable office perceives that he holds it at the precarious favor of ignorant politicians. For instance, a considerable part of the book consists of trivial stories of the Civil War, with striking “journalistic” headings, under which we find, perhaps, a tale of heroism on the part of some one now high in political office in the state, or the noisy refutation of a “wicked slander” against some military organization. There are pictures, too; for we all know that government publications, to be popular with the lower grade of politicians, must contain cheap pictures. The volume contains 586 mortal pages of muster-rolls, for which our state legislatures have of late developed an extraordinary fancy. It will illustrate the quality of the index if we say that, of its 59 pages, 48 are given up solidly to the entry “Colonial Troops” under C. The one part of the volume which was decidedly well worth printing is the 240 pages in which, with lively and humorous headlines, we are given a series of the colonial records of the years 1664–1673. But these records, which are not presented in chronological order, show so great a lack of editing and of proper explanation as to MS. sources that their value to the historical student is much impaired. Nor is their text above suspicion; the experienced reader of seventeenth-century hand readily perceives errors of a kind indicating ignorance of that hand. When one remembers the labors of John Romeyn Brodhead, one cannot contemplate with perfect patience the present work of the state of New York in historical publication. Cannot things be bettered?

The sixth and final volume of the series of "Women of Colonial and Revolutionary Times" is *Catherine Schuyler*, by Mary Gay Humphreys (Scribner, pp. 251). A real biography of the wife of General Philip Schuyler is plainly an impossibility. The author admits that the only letter of Mrs. Schuyler's that can now be traced is one which "begs the favor of Captain Varick to purchase two thousand oysters and to get Mrs. Vernon or somebody that understands it to pickle them." Apart from the dates of the heroine's birth, marriage and death, and the births, and in some cases marriages, of her fourteen children, there seem to be virtually no materials except such as can be derived by inference from the records of her husband's life or from the political and social history of the times. Under such circumstances it is inevitable that the book should be all background. But it is agreeable reading, and gives a pleasant picture of life at Albany and Saratoga during the last part of the last century.

Miss Ellen Strong Bartlett's *Historical Sketches of New Haven* (New Haven: Tuttle, Morehouse and Taylor; pp. 98) is a series of gracefully written and entertaining papers on points of historical interest in New Haven, with much incidental information regarding persons of note who have been connected with the city. It is profusely and well illustrated and finely printed. Though hardly formal history, the book brings together in a useful way many historical facts of importance, and it will be found by the visitor to New Haven greatly superior to the common run of souvenir literature.

Mr. G. M. Philips, principal of the State Normal School at West Chester, Pennsylvania, has printed for private distribution a pamphlet of 37 pages containing *Historic Letters* from the collection possessed by that school. There are fifteen letters from among the papers of Gen. Anthony Wayne, and four derived from a collection of the correspondence of Gen. Persifer F. Smith. Among the former are letters of Wayne, Washington, Schuyler, Sullivan, Arnold, and Gates. The others are ante-bellum letters of Scott, McClellan, Taylor, and Jefferson Davis.

The American Jewish Historical Society has brought out No. 6 of its *Publications* (pp. 180). The secretary reports 211 members. Though not quite equal in interest to some of the preceding issues, the number contains several interesting matters. Dr. J. H. Hollander contributes a series of documents from the Public Record Office relating to the attempted departure of the Jews from Surinam in 1675. Dr. Herbert Friedenwald, by means of advertisements in the Philadelphia newspapers of the last century, casts new light on the history of some of the prominent Hebrew residents of that town. Mr. Max J. Kohler contributes two articles, one on the Jews of Newport, one on the civil status of the Jews in colonial New York. Mr. N. Taylor Phillips reviews the history of the Congregation Shearith Israel. Mr. David Sulzberger makes a statistical investigation of the growth of the Jewish population in the United States.



The thirteenth volume of the publications of the Filson Club, bearing the general title of *The First Explorations of Kentucky*, is a reprint, with appropriate and scholarly notes and introductions by Mr. J. Stoddard Johnstone, vice-president of the club, of the journals of Dr. Thomas Walker, 1750, and of Christopher Gist, 1751. Walker's journal is not edited from the original manuscript. The text is taken from Rives's edition of 1888, but twenty pages which were missing from that publication are now supplied from the original manuscript. The text of Gist is taken from Darlington's edition, Pittsburg, 1888. A map showing the routes of these first recorded explorations is given.

The *Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada*, published last year by Professor George M. Wrong, of the University of Toronto, appears to have met with the success it deserved, for the second volume, relating to the publications of the year 1897, has now appeared in due course of time. In the editing of the new volume (pp. 238) Professor Wrong has been assisted by Mr. H. H. Langton, librarian of the University of Toronto, by whom the book is also published. It may likewise be obtained of Mr. William Briggs, of the same town. About a hundred and fifty publications—books and articles in periodicals—are noticed in the volume. The contents are grouped in five divisions: Canada's Relations to the Empire; the History of Canada; Provincial and Local History; Geography, Economics and Statistics; Law and Education and Bibliography. Great effort has evidently been made toward completeness, and the annual survey is, by consequence, highly interesting, affording a most satisfactory notion of what is being done for Canadian history both within the Dominion and without. The reader in the United States, usually too neglectful of Canadian matters, will be surprised to find how much of our historical literature has a bearing on Canadian history, and will be interested and benefited by seeing how such books appear when looked at from a Canadian point of view. The execution of the individual reviews is distinctly better than in the former volume.

## NOTES AND NEWS

M. Ernest Hamel, the biographer of Robespierre, died in Paris on January 6, aged 71. Besides his three-volume life of Robespierre, he wrote a *Vie de St. Just*, a *Histoire de la République sous le Directoire et le Consulat*, a book on the conspiracies of General Malet, and a volume on Étienne Marcel.

The Archaeological Institute of America, desiring to acquire greater unity and uniformity in its publications, has determined hereafter to issue all its publications and those of the Schools of Classical Studies at Athens and Rome in a periodical of its own; and for this purpose has acquired the *American Journal of Archaeology*. It has now issued, under the care of Professor J. H. Wright, of Harvard, as editor-in-chief, assisted by a distinguished editorial board, the first two numbers of the *American Journal of Archaeology, Second Series, The Journal of the Archaeological Institute of America*, a handsome periodical, published by The Macmillan Co. The first number consists of the first annual report of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome (1895-1896). The second contains the annual reports of the Council of the Institute and of the Schools at Athens and Rome for 1896-1897.

The first half of Dr. R. L. Poole's *Historical Atlas of Modern Europe* is now completed by the issue of Part XV. It contains three maps: one of Scotland about 1600, by Mr. G. Gregory Smith, one showing the ecclesiastical organization of the Spanish peninsula, by the editor, one of Western Asia under the Mohammedan dynasties toward the end of the tenth and of the eleventh centuries, by Mr. S. Lane-Poole. The Scottish map is based on contemporary manuscript maps and documents, and gives the territorial or district names (Eskdale, Tweeddale, Teviotdale, etc.), as well as those of counties, towns, etc. The letter-press to the Spanish map includes a chronological table, showing the successive restoration of sees during the Middle Ages, as Christendom advanced on Islam. The execution of the maps is, like those of the whole series, admirable. Part XIV. contains a map of France in the thirteenth century, by Mr. W. E. Rhodes, and a double map of the Eastern Roman Empire in the tenth century, by Professor Bury.

In a land so devoted to genealogy as ours, a systematic treatise on the general subject, by a competent scientific authority, ought surely to be welcomed. Such a book is Professor Ottokar Lorenz's *Lehrbuch der gesamten wissenschaftlichen Genealogie; Stammbaum und Ahnentafel in ihrer geschichtlichen sociologischen und naturwissenschaftlichen Bedeutung* (Berlin, Besser, pp. 489).

Another of the auxiliary sciences is the theme of the latest issue in the *Historische Bibliothek*, which is published by the editors of the *Historische Zeitschrift*: Dr. Richard Rosenmund's *Die Fortschritte der Diplomatie seit Mabillon vornehmlich in Deutschland-Oesterreich* (Munich, R. Oldenbourg, pp. 125).

#### ANCIENT HISTORY.

The Macmillan Co. announce a *History of Greece for High Schools and Academies*, by Dr. G. W. Botsford, of Harvard University, and, as a companion volume, a book of the *Sources of Greek History*, in translation, by Miss A. B. Thompson.

Professor Kurt Wachsmuth's rectoral address at Leipzig, *Ueber Ziele und Methoden der griechischen Geschichtschreibung*, has been published as a small pamphlet (pp. 19) by A. Edelmann of that city.

The first part of Dr. Edmund Lange's critical review of publications relating to Thucydides since 1890, reprinted from *Philologus*, may now be obtained in separate form (pp. 56) from Dieterich of Leipzig.

The American excavations at Corinth and Sparta are described in the January *Forum*, by M. Jean Gennadius.

Messrs. B. G. Teubner, of Leipzig, announce an important study in the economic history of ancient times, by G. Billeter, *Geschichte des Zinsfusses im griechischen-römischen Altertum bis zur Zeit Justinians*.

A new section of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, a part of the supplement to Vol. IV., has been published, containing pp. 273-454 of the wax tablets discovered in 1875 and in 1887, edited by Dr. Karl Zangemeister (Berlin, G. Reimer).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Sir H. H. Howorth, *The Early History of Babylonia*, I. (*English Historical Review*, January); F. L. Griffith, *Wills in Ancient Egypt* (*Law Quarterly Review*, January); R. Pöhlmann, *Die Anfänge des Sozialismus in Europa* (*Historisches Zeitschrift*, LXXX. 2); W. Soltan, *Die römischen Laudationen und ihr Einfluss auf die Annalistik* (*Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, n. s. II. 2); B. Heisterbergk, *Municeps* (*Philologus*, LV. 3).

#### EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

Messrs. Roberts Brothers, of Boston, are continuing their translation of Renan's *Origines* by the issue of a translation of his *Antichrist*, by Mr. Joseph H. Allen.

Mr. G. Margoliouth has reprinted in a separate tract (London, David Nutt) his contribution to the *Journal* of the Royal Asiatic Society, called *The Liturgy of the Nile*, using the Palestinian Syriac text of that document, with translations, introductions, etc. The text contains a liturgy to be used for the rising of the Nile, a survival of an earlier Egyptian

rite. A new edition of the Palestinian Gospels (based upon two fresh manuscripts from Mt. Sinai), and a lectionary of the Old and New Testaments, both edited by Mrs. Lewis, are now passing through the press.

The Coptic version of the Acts of Paul, discovered by Carl Schmidt, is discussed by him in the *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, VII. 117-124; by Professor Adolf Harnack in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1897, No. 24, 625 to 629; and by Theodor Zahn in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* for December, pp. 933-940.

The collection by V. Forcella and E. Seletti, *Iscrizioni Cristiane in Milano anteriori al nono secolo* (Cadogno, A. G. Cairo, pp. xxx, 275), not only presents the Christian inscriptions of Milan with greater completeness than in any previous collection, the number being 254 besides fragments, but gives them with much greater exactness, and presents facsimiles of 133.

#### MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

Dr. Conrad Eubel, whose *Hierarchia Catholica* we recently announced, is now about to publish the fifth volume of his *Bullarium Franciscanum*, issued under the sanction of the general of the order, and containing a further installment of the constitutions, epistles and grants issued by the popes to the order.

Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole, author of the British Museum catalogues of Oriental coins, has printed a catalogue of the collection of Arabic coins preserved in the Khedivial Library at Cairo, the special strength of which lies in the series of coins made under the Omayyad and Abbasside caliphs, and in those of the various Egyptian dynasties.

Dr. Reinhold Röhricht's long-expected *Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem* (1100-1291), a substantial volume of 1105 pages, is published by Wagner, of Innsbruck.

#### MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY.

The fourth volume of the *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu* has just been published at Madrid. It extends to 1556, and contains the quarterly reports sent to Rome by Jesuits from all parts of the world except India and Brazil.

Apropos of the present interest in Crete, Monsignor Gaetano Beani has printed (Pistoia, Cacialli) a small book on *Clemente IX. e l'Isola di Candia*, virtually a revised version of the part relating to Crete in his biography of that pontiff, published in 1893.

Captain Mahan's *Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire* has been translated into German by Admiral Batsch, at the instance of the Imperial Naval Council, and will be published by Mittler in Berlin.

## GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

The British Government has just issued the first volume (1461-1467) of the *Calendars of Patent Rolls* for the reign of Edward IV.; and a new volume of the *Calendars of Treasury Books and Papers*, 1729-1730.

The Historical Manuscripts Commission has issued (Fifteenth Report, App. VII., VIII.) a volume on the MSS. of the Earl of Carlisle at Castle Howard, in which students of the last years of our Revolution will find the correspondence of George Selwyn with the fourth Earl of Carlisle interesting; and another on the MSS. of the Duke of Buccleuch at Drumlanrig, of which the most important part relates to the correspondence of the third duke, and illustrates the latter part of the period of the Restoration. The Commission will shortly issue their third and concluding volume on the Harley Correspondence, belonging to the Duke of Portland; a volume on the papers of the Duke of Somerset, the Marquis of Ailesbury, and the late Sir F. G. Puleston; one on the collections of Mr. J. J. Hope Johnstone of Annandale, and continuations of the Buccleuch, Salisbury, Ormonde and Fortescue papers. Much special attention is now being given to Welsh manuscripts, especially the Mostyn and Peniarth collections.

The last two Congresses of Archaeological Societies resolved to promote the formation of a national catalogue of portraits, as an important branch of historical research, and systematic efforts to obtain the necessary information are now being made through the local societies which are affiliated in the Congress, and through individual circulars.

An *Index of (English) Archaeological Papers published in 1896* (pp. 53) has been issued under the direction of the Congress of Archaeological Societies and the Society of Antiquaries. It is the sixth issue of the series, and completes the index for the period 1891 to 1896. Certain sets of transactions not included in the previous annual pamphlets are here indexed throughout these six years. An index of all these transactions and journals from their beginning down to 1890 is ready in manuscript, merely awaiting funds for its publication.

Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co. have begun to issue in parts an *Index to the Early Printed Books in the British Museum*, edited by R. Proctor. The volume, when completed, will contain between 800 and 900 pages, and will present a list of the books printed in the fifteenth century, which were in the library of the Museum on the 1st of July, 1897, together with additions containing such books as are also or only in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. The edition will be limited.

The second volume of the *Bibliotheca Lindesiana*, compiled by the Earl of Crawford, consists of a list of proclamations from 1509 to 1837, arranged in chronological order, with notice of the contents and indication in what library or printed work each may be found. It forms thus a useful supplement to the *Calendars of State Papers*.

Mr. Thomas D. Atkinson's *Cambridge Described and Illustrated, being a Short History of the Town and University* (London, Macmillan, pp. 528) is especially designed to bring into new prominence the town of Cambridge, and to dispel the common notion of its being a mere appanage of the university. The book is elaborately illustrated by the reproduction of old plates and by new drawings.

The Ford Lectures at Oxford this winter were given by Professor F. W. Maitland, of Cambridge.

Dr. P. Hume Brown, the biographer of John Knox and of George Buchanan, is so far advanced with his *History of Scotland* that the first volume, bringing down the narrative to the accession of Mary Stuart, will probably be published by the Cambridge University Press this spring.

An Irish Text Society has been formed as an off-shoot of the Irish Literary Society, for the purpose of publishing texts in the Irish language, accompanied by introductions, English translations, and brief notes. The society will devote itself chiefly to manuscripts hitherto unpublished and will bring out both Middle-Irish texts and modern texts of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Among the early undertakings of the committee will be a complete edition of Keating's *History of Ireland*.

Professor J. Rhys, professor of Celtic in the University of Oxford, is understood to be preparing a book entitled *Celts and Pre-Celts and their Idioms and Institutions, as Illustrated by Inscriptions found in the British Isles*. It will contain the texts of the inscriptions, followed by chapters of notes and deductions bearing on the Celtic and Pictish peoples.

The approaching anniversary of King Alfred's death will be made the occasion of the publication of a *Life of King Alfred* by Professor York Powell, and of a book of extracts from the original authorities for King Alfred's life and times, edited and translated by the same scholar.

A new edition of King Alfred's translation of Bede has begun to appear in Grein's (Wülker's) *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa*, the first half, edited by Dr. Jacob Schipper, having been published at Leipzig by G. H. Wigand, *König Alfred's Übersetzung von Bedas Kirchengeschichte*, I. (pp. ix, 272). Dr. Schipper has reprinted from the transactions of the Vienna Academy a brief paper (pp. 13) on *Die Geschichte und der gegenwärtige Stand der Forschung über König Alfred's Übersetzung von Bedas Kirchengeschichte*.

The Corporation of Leicester have authorized the publication of a volume of extracts from their earliest muniments, 1100 to 1329, to be edited by Miss Mary Bateson, and to be printed at the Cambridge University Press.

The Council of the Scottish Text Society announces a new edition of the *Chronicles* of Robert Lindsay of Pitcottie, edited by Dr. Æneas Mackay. The original print extended only to 1565. A manuscript has



now been discovered which contains the completion to the year 1575, and this new matter will be printed by the Society.

The Parish Register Society has privately printed the *Baptisms at Stratford-on-Avon* from March, 1558, to March, 1663, containing the register of Shakspeare's baptism, and a considerable number of other entries relating to his family.

The Navy Records Society, finding that their *Journal of Sir George Rooke*, noticed in our last number, was printed from a quite inaccurate transcript, supply to possessors of the volume a list of errata.

Beginning with its issue of February 19, *Literature* is printing a remarkable series of Nelson papers. Chief in interest among them are his letters to his wife in the years 1794-1797, of which some have not been known before, while others have been printed so incorrectly as to give a quite unfair notion of the relations of the husband and wife.

Under the direction of Dr. George M. Theal, colonial historiographer, the government of the Cape Colony has been perfecting its archives by procuring copies of important papers from Europe. Those of the period from 1652 to 1795 have been copied in the archives at the Hague; those from 1795 to 1826, at the Public Record Office in London. A considerable amount of Portuguese matter relating to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is also being copied. A number of volumes of such material are being printed for the Cape government.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. W. Maitland, *A Prologue to the History of English Law* (Law Quarterly Review, January); F. Barling, *The Conqueror's Footprints in Domesday* (English Historical Review, January); J. R. Tanner, *The Administration of the Navy from the Restoration to the Revolution*, II. (English Historical Review, January); J. F. Chance, *Jean de Robethon and the Robethon Papers* (English Historical Review, January).

#### FRANCE.

The University of Paris has issued the fourth volume of the *Cartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, containing documents illustrating the period from 1394 to 1452, the date at which the constitution of the university was reformed by Cardinal D'Estouteville. Vol. V. will contain documents of the same period relating more especially to religious matters, and will, apparently, conclude the series.

The last issue of the series called *Story of the Nations* is a volume on *Modern France, 1789-1895*, by M. André Lebon.

M. F. Castanié will shortly publish an *Itinéraire de Napoléon*, prepared with great labor from original authorities, in which Napoleon will be followed from day to day, and on days of battle from half-hour to half-hour.

M. P. Marmottan's *Elisa Bonaparte* (Paris, Champion, pp. 318) is only the beginning of an elaborate study of its subject. Elisa's career as Princess of Lucca and Grand-duchess of Tuscany are to be treated later. From various documents, sixty pages of which are printed in the book, the author contrives to cast not a little new light, especially on the period of the Consulate. Another member of the Bonaparte connection is being treated in a similar manner, after very serious archive-studies, by Mme. Caroline d'Arjuzon in her *Hortense de Beauharnais* (Calmann Lévy), which proceeds from 1783 to 1803, and is to be followed by *La Reine Hortense* and *La Comtesse de St. Leu*.

M. G. Bertin's *La Campagne de 1814* (Paris, Flammarion, pp. 354) is a patient study, on the same plan as his previous books on the campaigns of 1812 and 1813, of the eye-witness account of the struggle.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Abbé Vacandard, *Saint Ouen avant son Episcopat* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, January); P. Fournier, *L'Oeuvre Canonique d'Yves de Chartres et son Influence* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, January); L. Le Grand, *Les Maisons-Dieu; leur Régime Intérieur au Moyen Age* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, January); V. Pierre, *Le Clergé Français en Allemagne pendant la Révolution* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, January); A. Sorel, *L'Europe et le Directoire, V. La Révolution de Brumaire* (*Revue des deux Mondes*, January 1); H. Houssaye, *La Bataille de Ligny* (*Revue des deux Mondes*, January 15, February 1); E. Ollivier, *Napoléon III., I.* (*Revue des deux Mondes*, February 15); Baron Du Casse, *Le 5<sup>e</sup> Corps d'Armée d'Italie en 1859, I.* (*Revue Historique*, March); Duc de Broglie, *Victor Duruy* (*Revue des deux Mondes*, February 1).

#### ITALY, SPAIN, PORTUGAL.

In the January number of the *Revue des Questions Historiques*, Doctor Pedro Roca presents a detailed review of the Spanish historical publications of the years 1895, 1896, and M. Léon G. Pélissier of those of Italy. The former are also reviewed by Señor Rafael Altamira in the *Revue Historique* of March-April.

Professor Pasquale Villari has been chosen president of the Istituto Storico Italiano, in the place of the late Senator Marco Tabarrini.

The Prince of Naples has decided to undertake the publication of a *Corpus Nummorum Italicorum*, based on his own remarkable collection and on the other chief collections of Europe. The work is intended to have a magnitude and an excellence which will make it of great use to historical students. It is computed that fifty thousand coins will be described in it.

Fasc. III.-IV. of Vol. XX. of the *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria* contains a treatise on some manuscripts of the *Liber Pontificalis*, by I. Giorgi; a thorough-going article on the taxes on salt

and firewood in mediæval Rome, by G. Tomassetti; and an account of the possessions of the Colonna family in the fifteenth century, by Professor Lanciani.

With a volume of 409 pages on the kingdom of Italy (Leipzig, G. H. Wigand) Dr. Ludo Moritz Hartmann begins the publication of an extensive work entitled *Geschichte Italiens im Mittelalter*. An essay in a related field is Dr. Wilhelm Marten's *Beleuchtung der neuesten Controversen über die römische Frage unter Pippin und Karl dem Grossen* (Munich, C. H. Beck, pp. 158).

The municipality of Florence intends to celebrate this spring the centenary of Paolo Toscanelli (born 1398), and that of Amerigo Vespucci. The festivities will be elaborate. The Commissione per le Pubblicazioni Scientifiche will take occasion of the celebration to publish the Vagliensi manuscript, containing the relation of the supposed Vespuccian voyage of 1497, edited by Professor Gustavo Uzielli. The president of the committee having charge of the celebration is the Marquis Torrigiani, syndic of Florence.

Signor Isidoro del Lungo's *Florentia; Uomini e Cose del Quattrocento* (Florence, Barbèra) has for the most important part of its content a careful investigation of the life and personality of Politian, but by other means likewise illustrates, with learning and insight, the life of the city in his times.

Signor Benedetto Croce, in his *Studi Storici sulla Rivoluzione Napoletana del 1799* (Rome, Loescher and Co., pp. 290), presents interesting results from careful studies into the history of Eleonora de Fonseca and the *Monitore Napoletano*, of Vincenzo Russo, of Luisa Sanfelice and the Baccher conspiracy, of the Neapolitan Jacobins before 1799, and of Domenico Cirillo and the pardon offered him by Hamilton and Nelson.

Much light is cast upon an important period of the modern history of Italy by the publication of the full and impartial record of events in 1870-1871, kept in the form of a diary by Senator Stefano Castagnola, and now published by his son-in-law Signor E. Devoto, with notes by Augusto Ferrero. The diary extends from August 20, 1870, when Prince Napoleon came to Florence to invoke the alliance of Italy, to November 27, 1871, the day of the first meeting of the Italian parliament at Rome. During all this period Castagnola was minister of agriculture, industry and commerce. The diary is published under the title: *Di Firenze a Roma; Diario Storico-politico del 1870-71* (Turin, Roux, Frassati and Co.).

The *Revista Critica de Historia y Literatura* for October contains a careful account of the life and works of the late Don Pascual de Gayángos y Arce. The November-December number contains a long and final instalment of Señor Julian Ribera's study of "El Justicia de Aragón y la Organizacion Jurídica de los Musulmanes Españoles."

This series, with other chapters added, has been published in a volume with the title *Orígenes del Justicia de Aragón*. With its January number the *Revista* changes to a small quarto form, instead of small folio, but with an increased number of pages. The address of the editor, Señor Rafael Altamira, is now at the University of Oviedo.

Don José Ramón de Luanco, professor of chemistry in the University of Barcelona, has published the second volume of his elaborate and scholarly studies in the history of alchemy, *La Alquimia en España* (Barcelona, pp. 289).

Captain Fernandez Duro has published the third volume (Madrid, pp. 522) of his history of the Spanish navy, *Armada Española desde la Unión de los Reinos de Castilla y de Aragón*, of which the first volume was reviewed in Vol. II., p. 344 of this journal.

Senhor Jeronymo da Camara Manuel, the editor of the letters of St. Francis Xavier, will review in the *Revista Crítica de Historia* the whole mass of the publications elicited by the centenary of the discovery of India by the Cape route.

#### GERMANY, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND.

Though the *Bibliographie der deutschen Zeitschriften-Litteratur* extends over the whole field of general bibliography and is not devoted to history alone, yet students of history may be glad to know of the existence of its first volume (Leipzig, F. Andrä's Nachf., pp. 184). This volume presents an index, composed somewhat after the manner of the annual Poole-Fletcher, of about 8,500 articles which appeared during 1896 in about 275 periodicals, chiefly scientific, in the German language. The author's name, the volume and page of the article, the name and address of the publisher, and the price of the periodical are given.

With the present month the *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* passes into the hands of the house of B. G. Teubner, of Leipzig, and becomes the *Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, under the editorial management of Dr. Gerhard Seeliger, professor in the University of Leipzig. Its general character is not expected to be essentially changed.

In the *Revue Historique* for January-February Dr. M. Philippson presents a detailed review of the German books of modern history published in 1896.

Vol. LXVIII. of the *Publikationen aus den kön. preussischen Staat-archiven* (Leipzig, S. Hirzel, pp. 641) is a volume of the political correspondence (1621-1631) of Count Franz Wilhelm von Wartenberg, bishop of Osnabrück. Vol. LXIX. is another instalment of the *Hessisches Urkundenbuch*, presenting documents relating to Hanau from 1376 to 1400. The government has brought out the twenty-fourth volume of the *Politische Correspondenz Friedrich's des Grossen* (Berlin, A. Duncker, pp. 435).

To the series of *Annalen der deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter*, third division (Ottonen und Salier), Dr. Gustav Richter has added a half-volume for the reign of Henry IV. edited by himself and a half-volume edited by Horst Kohl and Walter Opitz devoted to the reigns of Henry V. and Lothar. An appendix by Ernst Devrient deals with the constitution of the German empire under the Saxon and Salian emperors (Halle, Buchh. des Waisenhauses, pp. 782).

With a title-page which indicates that it is the first of a series of *Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen zu Janssens Geschichte des deutschen Volkes* put forth by Dr. Ludwig Pastor, Dr. Nikolaus Paulus publishes (Freiburg i. B., Herder, pp. 100) a brief work called *Luthers Lebensende, eine kritische Untersuchung*.

A beginning has now been made of publication in the second period or division (1560-1572) of the *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken*; the Vienna Academy has brought out, as Bd. I. (Vienna, C. Gerold's Sohn, pp. cviii, 453) the reports of the nuncii Hosius and Delfino, 1560-1561, edited by S. Steinherz. In the first period (1533-1559) the Prussian Historical Institute has published, as Vol. VIII., the documents for the nunciature of Verallo, 1545-1546, edited by Walter Friedensburg.

Two new memorials of Stein on the German constitution, from the papers of Stadion in the Vienna archives, are printed in the *Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXX. 2.

More than a purely municipal or local interest attaches to the second division of the *Urkunden und Akten der Stadt Strassburg*. It is a series of volumes of the political correspondence of the city during the period of the Reformation. Vol. III., covering the years 1540-1545, and edited by Otto Winckelmann, has just appeared (Strassburg, K. J. Trübner, pp. 780).

Karl Grosse's *Geschichte der Stadt Leipzig*, originally published in 1842, is now to be brought out in a new edition, adorned with some eighty pictures and plans taken from old and rare engravings. The first volume has already appeared (Leipzig, Zangenberg and Himly, pp. 594).

Dr. Ludwig von Thallóczy, chief of the Hofkammer archives at Vienna, will shortly publish a history of Hungary in the Middle Ages.

The Vienna Alterthumsverein has brought out, under the editorial care of Dr. Heinrich Zimmermann, the first volume of its *Geschichte der Stadt Wien* (Vienna, A. Holzhausen, pp. xxiv, 632). The volume is an elaborate folio, with 34 separate plates and 181 illustrations inserted in the text. It brings the narrative down to the time of the Hapsburgs, 1282.

Dr. Rudolf Stähelin's *Huldreich Zwingli, sein Leben und Wirken, nach den Quellen dargestellt*, is now completed by the publication of the fourth part, finishing Vol. II. (Basel, B. Schwabe, pp. 540).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Bresslau, *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Königswahlen von der Mitte des 13. bis zur Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft, n. s. II. 2); M. Lenz, *Napoleon I. und Preussen* (Cosmopolis, February).

#### NETHERLANDS.

Miss Ruth Putnam is completing a translation, begun some time ago, of Professor P. J. Blok's *Geschiedenis van het Nederlandsche Volk*.

Dr. Paul Fredericq has published the second volume of the *Geschiedenis der Inquisitie in de Nederlanden*, in which he presents the history of the inquisition, episcopal and papal, in the Netherlands to the end of the fourteenth century.

Mr. Jan Joris Mulder has published at Ghent *Twee Verhandelingen over de Inquisitie in de Nederlanden tijdens de XVI<sup>e</sup> Eeuw* (pp. 126).

#### NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE.

Mr. Oscar Browning, university lecturer on history at King's College, Cambridge, has just completed a life of Peter the Great, to be published by Messrs. Hutchinson, and intends to write a life of Charles XII. of Sweden, to be published by Messrs. Hurst and Blackett.

Professor B. Bilbassof's biographical and bibliographical work on the empress Catharine now appears in an authorized German translation, with a preface by Professor Theodor Schiemann of Berlin, *Katharina II., Kaiserin von Russland, im Urtheile der Weltliteratur* (Berlin, Stuhr, two vols., pp. 736).

The historical section of the Academy of Cracow has brought out, as Vol. XVI. of its *Scriptores Rerum Polonicarum*, the *Annales* of Stanislaus Temberski, 1647-1656, edited by Dr. Victor Czermak.

#### AMERICA.

Mr. George Thomas Watkins, of Indianapolis, has issued a preliminary list of brief titles of books and pamphlets relating to the history of printing in America, under the name *American Typographical Bibliography*, and asks aid toward a completer bibliography of the subject.

The sixteenth series of the *Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science*, the volume for 1898, begins with an extensive paper on the Neutrality of the American lakes and the Anglo-American Relations connected therewith, by Dr. J. M. Callahan. The following papers are announced as to follow: West Florida in its Relation to the Historical Cartography of the United States, by Mr. Henry E. Chambers, of New Orleans; Anti-Slavery Leaders of North Carolina, by Professor J. S. Bassett; the Life and Administration of Sir Robert Eden, by Dr. B. C. Steiner; the History of State Banking in Maryland, by Dr. A. C. Bryan; the Maryland and Virginia Boundary Controversy, by L. N. Whealton; the Labadist Colony in Maryland, by the Rev. B. B. James;



The Early Development of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Project, by Professor George W. Ward; Slavery in Virginia, by Dr. James C. Bal-lagh.

The American Jewish Historical Society held its sixth annual meeting at New York on December 29 and 30. Papers were read on the political history of the Jews in New York, on the early history of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews of Montreal, on the origins of the Jewish colony at New Amsterdam, on early Jewish wills of New York, on the manuscripts of Haym Solomon, and on the mystic and physicist, Jacob Philadelphia. Documentary matter relative to the Jews of Curaçao, Surinam, and Spanish America was presented.

M. Henry Harrisse has printed in a separate form a memoir entitled *L'Atterrage de Jean Cabot au Continent Américain en 1497*, read before the Royal Society of Göttingen in October and published in its *Nachrichten*.

The second volume of Professor A. B. Hart's *American History Told by Contemporaries* ("The Building of the Republic," 1689-1783) is now ready. Its publishers, The Macmillan Co., also announce *A Source-Book of American History*, by the same writer, intended for use in high schools and academies.

It is agreeable news that Miss Kate Mason Rowland's *Life of Charles Carroll of Carrollton* (Putnams) has been brought to publication. The same firm announce a series of volumes by Professor Moses Coit Tyler, entitled *A Century of American Statesmen*, in which the history of the century, in American politics, will be surveyed by means of forty-odd biographies of leading statesmen.

Hon. John Winslow has brought out as one of the publications of the New York Society of the Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, an interesting pamphlet of 39 pages on the *Battle of Lexington as Looked at in London Before Chief Justice Mansfield and a Jury in the Trial of John Horne, Esq., for Libel of the British Government*.

The Lundy's Lane Historical Society has now issued the second part of its *Documentary History of the Campaign on the Niagara Frontier in 1814* (James E. Wilson, the secretary of the Society, Niagara Falls South, Ontario). The documents have been derived from the Canadian archives, from the manuscripts of Governor Tompkins, and from those of General P. B. Porter and others. The volume, which extends to 298 pages, has been edited by Major E. Cruikshank.

The January number of the *Publications* of the Rhode Island Historical Society contains an article on the *Providence Gazette*, its publishers, publication offices and editors, by Dr. Amos Perry, and an account of the oldest town records in the state—the records of Portsmouth from 1639. The volume is being copied, and it is hoped that it will before long be printed.

The New London County Historical Society proposes to publish the *Diary of Joshua Hempstead* if a sufficient number of subscriptions are received. It covers the period from 1711 to 1758 and contains, besides matter relating to local history, many entries relating to the colonial wars, and a description of the author's journey from New London to Maryland.

The *Half-Moon Series* for 1898 will comprise, among other pieces, papers on Tammany Hall, by Mr. Talcott Williams; on slavery in old New York, by Mr. E. V. Morgan; on prisons and punishments, by Miss E. D. Lewis; on the Bowling Green, by Mr. Spencer Trask; on old taverns and posting inns, by Miss B. B. Cutting, and on the New York press in the eighteenth century, by Mr. B. E. Martin.

Rev. Dr. E. T. Corwin, official histographer of the General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church in America, has for some months been engaged in researches in the archives of the Classis of Amsterdam, relating to the early history of the churches in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Important materials are being obtained, and the Synod desires additional money for the prosecution of the work.

The Baptist Historical Collection which had been formed by the late Samuel Colgate has now been transferred from his home in Orange to the library of Colgate University at Hamilton, N. Y. The volumes and pamphlets now number 35,000. Mr. Colgate bequeathed to the university \$20,000, the income from which is to be used in caring for and enlarging the collection.

The second annual meeting of the Vassar Alumnae Historical Association was held at Vassar College on February 19. The number of members has risen to 160. The object of the association is to strengthen the educational bond between the alumnae and the college, and to keep up interest in local and other historical work.

Mr. Churchill G. Chamberlayne, of Richmond, Va., proposes, as soon as a sufficient number of subscribers has been obtained, to publish the *Vestry Book and Register of Bristol Parish*, recently rediscovered in the library of a deceased Virginian clergyman. The manuscript volume contains the records of vestry meetings from 1720 to 1789, and a register of births, baptisms and deaths extending over an even longer period. Mr. Chamberlayne's address is P. O. Drawer 927, Richmond.

The forty-fifth annual meeting of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin was held on December 9. The additions to the library were reported as 3809 books and 4886 pamphlets. In view of the approaching fiftieth anniversary of the state of Wisconsin, the society has issued pamphlets of suggestions looking toward appropriate historical celebrations by local historical societies or societies of pioneers or early settlers. The occasion has been taken to encourage the formation of such societies in large numbers, and the suggestions with regard to their activities on

this occasion and subsequently are of the most ingenious and sensible kind. The legislation of the state on such societies is printed, and suggested forms for their constitutions and by-laws.

At the annual meeting of the Wisconsin Academy of Science, Arts and Letters, December 27 to 29, Dr. O. G. Libby presented a paper on Some Economic Aspects of the Greenback and Populist Movements; Mr. B. H. Meyer a paper on Early General Railway Legislation in Wisconsin; Mr. Charles H. Chandler a historical note on Early American Railroads.

Professor Benjamin F. Shambaugh, of the State University of Iowa, continues his useful *Documentary Material relating to the History of Iowa* by the publication of Nos. 9, 10 and 11, containing laws concerning local government in the Northwest Territory, incidentally operative in Iowa. He has also published the first part (Dubuque County) of the *First Census of the Original Counties of Dubuque and Des Moines*. The former pamphlet is issued by the University, the latter by the Historical Department of the State government.

The National Museum of Mexico has recently published, for the first time, an important work on the history of the Dominican order in New Spain, *Libro Tercero de la Historia Religiosa de la Provincia de Mexico*, written by Fr. Hernando Ojea in 1608 as a continuation of Davila Padilla. The book, which relates specifically to the twenty years preceding its completion, is edited by Don José M. de Agreda y Sánchez, director of the National Library, who supplies an introduction and an appendix valuable for the economic history of New Spain in the sixteenth century.

The interesting history of the hospital founded by Cortés in the city of Mexico, written by Don Carlos de Signéza y Góngora in 1689, with the title *Piedad Heroica de D. Fernando Cortés*, has been reprinted through the agency of La Semana Católica of Mexico. It is edited by Dr. Nicolas León, from a transcript of an imperfect original. No printed copy of the original is now to be found. Dr. León is understood to be at work upon a history of the state of Chiapas. In conjunction with Mr. Lyman H. Low he has recently published (Cuernavaca) a short study of *La Moneda del General Insurgente Don José Maria Morelos*, which, besides its numismatic interest, conveys much information on points of economic history during the struggle carried on by Morelos.

*A Bibliografía de la Imprenta en Guatemala en los Siglos XVI y XVII* (pp. 121) by J. E. O'Ryon, is announced as privately printed at Santa Fé.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. C. Lodge, *The Story of the Revolution* (Scribner's Magazine, January-April); A. T. Mahan, *The Naval Campaign of 1776 on Lake Champlain* (Scribner's Magazine, February); W. P. Sterns, *International Indebtedness of the United States in 1789* (Journal of Political Economy, December).